

HETAIREIA IN HOMER

John Elias Esposito

A dissertation submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Chapel Hill
2015

Approved by:

Fred Naiden

William H. Race

James J. O'Hara

Emily Baragwanath

James Rives

© 2015
John Elias Esposito
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

John Elias Esposito: *Hetaireia* in Homer
(Under the direction of Fred Naiden)

This study addresses the neglected subject of *hetaireia* (roughly, “warrior-companionship”) in Homer. Although many discussions of Homer mention *hetairoi* in passing, no study treats semantic, poetic, social, and military aspects comprehensively. The purpose of this dissertation is to fill this gap. To this end I explicate the meaning of the *heta(i)r-* root, survey the social and military roles of Homeric *hetairoi*, and expose the way the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* use *hetaireia* to portray *pathos* and character. The argument is informed by the etymology of *heta(i)r-* from the PIE reflexive **swe-*, but rests on a catalogue and analysis of all scenes in which *hetairoi* appear.

The four chapters of this dissertation argue that *hetaireia* is a major axis on which both epics turn. The two chapters on the *Iliad* show what the world is like when *hetaireia* dominates and consider how a poem about war focuses on the bond between warriors and their companions. The two chapters on the *Odyssey* show how the world changes when *hetaireia* disappears and consider how a poem about homecoming replaces the relationships of the battlefield with the relationship between the *oikos* and the gods. A brief concluding chapter suggests how the analysis of *hetaireia* presented in this dissertation might affect Homeric studies, cultural, social, and military history of the archaic period, ancient philosophy, the history of psychology, and aspects of modern military psychology, particularly leadership and motivation in battle.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Fred Naiden first encouraged me to write on this topic and offered far more and better guidance and support than any advisor might be expected to give. I owe him the lion's share of thanks for his tremendous intelligence, erudition, dedication, and honesty throughout the writing process.

Bill Race, Jim O'Hara, Emily Baragwanath, and James Rives improved the dissertation immensely as readers. For help limiting scope and for countless examples of supremely lucid writing I owe Bill Race in particular. For innumerable insights on a short timeline I am in special debt to Jim O'Hara, who kindly agreed to join a project well underway. Their remarks played no small part in the successful aspects of the study presented here. All errors and infelicities are of course my own.

Many others deserve special thanks. Peter Smith has always encouraged me to read Homer more carefully, and his comments on the *Iliad* have guided me away from many interpretive dead ends. The dissertation has also benefited from remarks by Ben Sammons, a true Homerist. Sharon James has often supported me when research projects seemed intractable or impossible. Bruce McMenomy first helped me understand ancient epic and read classic literature critically.

My dialectical and rhetorical abilities were (and still are) honed by countless arguments with my brothers Steve, Mike, Ricky, and Peter. My parents began the education that led to this project—along with my existence—and cannot be thanked enough. Most of all I owe my wife

Sarah, who has immeasurably sharpened my mind on all matters classical and other matters as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: <i>HETAIREIA</i> IN THE <i>ILIAD</i> : MEANING, ACTIVITY, NATURE	13
Introduction	13
1.1 <i>Heta(i)r-</i> : etymology, reference, descriptors	14
1.2 Actions of <i>hetairoi</i>	19
1.3 The <i>pathos</i> of <i>hetaireia</i>	39
1.4 Analysis: three attributes of <i>hetaireia</i>	56
CHAPTER 2: GROUPS OF <i>HETAIROI</i> IN THE <i>ILIAD</i>	68
Introduction	68
2.1 ἔθνος ἑταίρων as group of <i>hetairoi</i>	71
2.2 Leading groups of <i>hetairoi</i>	86
CHAPTER 3: DISSOLVING <i>HETAIREIA</i> IN THE <i>ODYSSEY</i>	140
Introduction	140
3.1 Distrust: <i>hetaireia</i> begins to dissolve	148
3.2 Dissention: rebellion, restructuring, retreat	161
3.3 Destruction: the road to Thrinakia	179
3.4 Solidarity lost: the overthrow of Odysseus by his <i>hetairoi</i>	198
CHAPTER 4: REPLACING <i>HETAIREIA</i> IN THE <i>ODYSSEY</i>	203
Introduction	203
4.1 What Odyssean <i>hetairoi</i> are not	206
4.2 Odysseus' new allies	237
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND POSTSCRIPT	282
5.1 Effects of changing <i>hetaireia</i> on the transition from <i>Iliad</i> 1 to <i>Odyssey</i> 24	282

5.2 Non-literary implications beyond the world of epic.....	289
5.3 Prospective: <i>hetaireia</i> and military companionship after Homer.....	297
APPENDIX	301
Table 1: Combat motivation in the <i>Iliad</i>	302
Table 2: Actions of/to/for/with <i>hetairoi</i> in the <i>Iliad</i>	308
Table 3: Human leadership in the <i>Iliad</i>	314
Table 4: Words describing <i>hetairoi</i>	321
Table 5: Relative strength of warrior and <i>hetairos</i>	324
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	325

HETAIREIA IN HOMER: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This study addresses the neglected subject of *hetaireia*¹ in Homer. Although many discussions of Homer mention *hetairoi* in passing, no study treats semantic, poetic, social, and military aspects comprehensively. The purpose of this dissertation is to fill this gap. To this end I explicate the meaning of the *heta(i)r-* root,² survey the social and military roles of Homeric *hetairoi*, and expose the way the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* use *hetaireia* to portray *pathos* and character.³ The argument is informed by the etymology of *heta(i)r-* from the PIE reflexive **swe-*, but rests on a catalogue and analysis of all scenes in which *hetairoi* appear.

The scholarly neglect of *hetaireia* is all the more serious insofar as *hetairoi* are vital to both Homeric poems. The turning-point of the *Iliad*, and the cause of Achilles' greatest sorrow, is the death of his *hetairos* Patroclus. The climax of the *Odyssey* proem, and the cause of Odysseus' greatest sorrow, is the death of his *hetairoi*. The relationship between these principal heroes and their *hetairoi* is widely understood as a kind of affection, but the specific character of *hetaireia* has not been examined in detail. Nor have the differing ways in which different heroes relate to their *hetairoi* been considered comprehensively, in spite of growing scholarly awareness of the psychological depth and narrative sophistication of the Homeric poems.

¹ The abstract noun does not appear in Homer but is common in Attic. The Homeric scholia include forms of ἡταιρία (as an abstract noun) eight times. I follow them in using *hetaireia* to describe relationships that include *hetairoi*.

² Throughout the dissertation I will name the root using a parenthetical iota because the Homeric poet includes the iota in some passages and excludes it in others, apparently for metrical reasons. There is no semantic difference between *hetaros* and *hetairos*.

³ This is not to deny the importance of the orality of Homeric epic, of course. Albert Lord himself insisted that “[in] the extended sense of the word, oral tradition is as ‘literary’ as literary tradition” (Lord 1960, 141).

Furthermore, although scholars widely recognize that the *Odyssey* poet blames Odysseus' *hetairoi* in the proem as warriors are never blamed in the *Iliad*, the difference between the moral worlds of the two poems with respect to the bond between hero and companions remains poorly understood. If the two narratives are interpreted together, the moral difference appears as a transformation: the *hetairoi* of the *Odyssey* proem are combat veterans of the Trojan war, but while Iliadic *hetairoi* die at the hands of enemies in battle, Odyssean *hetairoi* bring about their own destruction. The movement from a poem about warriors dying to a poem about a warrior returning home presumably has something to do with the transition from war to peace, but the change in warrior-companionship itself, commonly signified by the *heta(i)r-* root, has not been studied across both epics.

In this dissertation I examine both the meaning of words containing *heta(i)r-* and the relationship signified thereby. I derive the semantics and the social significance of *hetaireia* from a comprehensive study of usage of *heta(i)r-*, a summary of which appears in five tables in an appendix. The resulting analysis presents *hetaireia* as a hitherto unrecognized type of social relationship, distinct from and irreducible to *philia*, *xenia*, and the relationship between shepherd/commander and the *laos/laoi*. In the *Iliad*, *hetaireia* obtains *de facto*: warriors are called *hetairoi* when they function as and are felt as companions in battle. In the *Odyssey*, in non-military settings, warriors are called *hetairoi* because they once fought together or because they are mutual supporters against the danger of the sea, companions bound together because they are all in the same boat.

The examination of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* reveals previously unrecognized features of Iliadic warrior psychology and sheds new light on central characters and incidents in the poem. In the *Iliad*, *hetaireia* is essential to the depiction of combat psychology, insofar as motivation in

battle is dominated by concern for warrior-companions. *Hetaireia* appears especially important to the Myrmidons in general and to Achilles and Patroclus in particular. Agamemnon's weak *hetaireia* parallels his other shortcomings as a leader. Hector's dedication to his family and his city is shown to come at the expense of his relationship with his *hetairoi*. These observations contribute to our understanding of these characters and to their approach to military leadership and organization.

Hetaireia is no less central to the *Odyssey*. The proem signals the importance of *hetaireia* explicitly: the self-destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi* is the climax of the list of Odysseus' sufferings. By focusing on *hetaireia* I show how the *Apologoi* are tied together, and fitted in the particular sequence in which they are narrated, by the progressive erosion of trust between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*, amplified by foolish decisions made by commander and companions, each of which causes the one to trust the other less. Beyond the disaster on Thrinakia, the breakdown of *hetaireia* has a more lasting result: Odysseus' human supporters on Ithaca are never called *hetairoi*, a fact that has not previously been noted, and consist only of members of the *oikos*: son, father, and slaves. Odysseus' only *hetairos* on Ithaca is Athena herself—a striking departure from the *Iliad*, where no gods are called *hetairoi*, and a sign of the simultaneous transformation of both *hetaireia* itself and also the relationship between humans and gods.

The four chapters of this dissertation argue that *hetaireia* is a major axis on which both epics turn. The chapters on the *Iliad* show what the world is like when *hetaireia* dominates and consider how a poem about war focuses on the bond between warriors and their companions. The chapters on the *Odyssey* show how the world changes when *hetaireia* disappears and consider how a poem about homecoming replaces the relationships of the battlefield with the relationship between the *oikos* and the gods.

The bulk of the argument is literary-critical and cultural-historical and makes no claims about social or military *realia*. Accordingly, most of the primary evidence is taken from the received texts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁴ Concepts from historical linguistics, Indo-European studies, military history, and anthropology of war appear only where they clarify a particular point.

* * *

Ancient attempts to define Homeric *hetaireia* are inconsistent and often imprecise. Homeric scholia gloss *hetairoi* variously as *philoι*, *etai*, *politai*, and *sunergoi*. Commentators, grammarians, and lexicographers offer more detail, mainly on philological⁵ and philosophical⁶ grounds. But the ancient scholarly consensus is quite vague. Everybody knows that it has

⁴ For this I rely on the OCT editions by Monro and Allen. Textual issues affect my argument in only one place, noted in Chapter 3.

⁵ Orion of Thebes (Proclus' teacher, 5th century CE) explains *hetairos* etymologically: *hetairos* comes from *ethos* via *ethairos* by metathesis of theta into tau. The *Etymologicum Magnum* and *Etymologicum Gudianum* follow Orion's etymology. Possibly still influenced by this etymology, the *Etymologicum Magnum* adds '[military] helper' (βοηθός) to its otherwise standard list of synonyms for *hetairos*. Philoponus goes so far as to consider *hetairos* merely an euphonically-motivated variant of *philos* (ὁ φίλος ὅταν προπερισπᾶται καὶ ψιλοῦται). Aristonicus implicitly identifies *hetairoi* with *etai* by athetizing a passage on the grounds that 'ἔτας καὶ ἐταίρους' is redundant, and Aristophanes glosses *hetairoi* and *etai* together but affirms that both are of the same age (τῇ τε ἡλικίᾳ), which is not always true in Homer (most notably Achilles and Patroclus). Apion adds a nautical connotation, glossing *etai* as *philoι* and *polites* but *hetairos* as *philos*, *sunergos*, and *eretes* (citing *Iliad* 1.179 and surprisingly not the *Odyssey passim*); but the *Etymologicum Gudianum* probably draws on the *Odyssey* and Apollonius' *Argonautica* to gloss *hetairoi* as 'οἱ σύμπλοοι καὶ συνναῦται'. Apollonius regressively defines *etai* as '*politai*, *hetairoi*, *sunetheis*'. Pseudo-Ammonius(=Herennius Philo), in the business of making distinctions (the work is titled 'περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφορῶν λέξεων'), insists that *hetairos* and *philos* are different (ἐταῖρος καὶ φίλος διαφέρει). His general semantic argument (*hetairoi* are fewer than *philoι*) seems correct but not revelatory, and his specifically Homeric argument (not every *hetairos* is *philos* because Homer uses *hetairos* to describe the wind (πλησίσιον ἐσθλὸν ἐταῖρον) at *Odyssey* 11.7 and 12.149) seems oblivious to metaphor.

⁶ Later ancient scholars are often influenced by Athenian philosophy and Macedonian practice, and increasingly tend to use *phil-* words to describe *hetaireia*. But this too is not consistent. Photius and Hesychius still identify *etai* and *hetairoi*, along with *sunetheis*; Hesychius additionally glosses *hetairos* as *sunergos*. Eustathius similarly defines *hetairos* as 'ὁ φίλος καὶ ὁ συνεργός'; and the *Suda* defines *hetaireia* as '*homonoia* of common habituation, and *philia*' (ἡ συνήθης ὁμόνοια, καὶ φιλία) and separately defines *hetairia* simply as 'ἡ φιλία'. The *suneth-* concept is joined with logicizing terminology in Pseudo-Zonaras' definition of *hetaireia* as 'the dignity and *homonoia* of common habituation' (τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ ἡ συνήθης ὁμόνοια).

something to do with friendship (*phil-*), even if *philia* and *hetaireia* are not quite the same. Many agree that it has something to do with something common (*sun-*), either activity (*sunergos*) or habit (*sunethes*). Several add common age, but even the case of Achilles and Patroclus falsifies this view; presumably the notion of shared age is anachronistically imported from *hetairoi* of the fifth and fourth centuries.

Modern attempts to define *hetaireia* do not depart radically from ancient scholarship. Social historians treat *hetairoi* as kin (incorrectly)⁷ or subordinates, sometimes confusing *hetairoi* with *therapontes*.⁸ The most convincing accounts treat *hetairoi* simply as companions⁹ without further specification.¹⁰ Military historians sometimes treat *hetairoi* (and other Homeric warriors in groups) as proto-hoplites insofar as *hetairoi* and other Homeric troops sometimes fight in masses,¹¹ but the Iliadic narrative is not consistent on this point, possibly for literary

⁷ Glotz 1904, 85ff identifies *etai* with *hetairoi* based on a small number of passages and is followed by Busolt 1920, 250-251; Guarducci 1937, 10; Hignett 1962, 58; Stagakis 1962 and 1968. Andrewes 1961, 134-137 refutes this position definitively; Gates 1971, 29-31 elaborates the distinction.

⁸ Finsler 1906, 332; Busolt 1920, 326-329; Nilsson 1933, 232-238; Mireaux 1954, 63; Stagakis 1966; refuted in Greenalgh 1982 and van Wees 1992, 42-48. Nagy 1979, chapter 6 comes close to treating *therapontes* and *hetairoi* interchangeably, but maintains the distinction when discussing the ritual significance of the *therapon*.

⁹ Jeanmaire 1939, 104-107; Finley 1954, 109-110; Andrewes 1961, 134-137; Palmer 1961, 107ff (incorrectly deriving *hetairos* from Mycenaean *he-qe-ta*); Benardete 1963; Kakridis 1963; Gates 1971, 29-31; Benveniste 1973 s.v.; Greenalgh 1982 (refuting the feudal interpretation of *hetaireia*); Donlan 1989, 12-22 (failing to distinguish *philos* from *hetairos*); van Wees 1992; Welwei 1992, 48; Konstan 1997, 31-33; Montes Miralles 2006, 60-64.

¹⁰ Kakridis 1963, 51-77 and Ulf 1990, 127-138 attempt further distinctions within *hetaireia*. Ulf's taxonomy goes as follows: Type 1 *hetairoi* are small in number but ethnically related and led by one great warrior. Type 2 *hetairoi* are large in number, led by a political leader, and compose a tribe (as in the modern English word *ethnos*). Type 3 *hetairoi* are sets of commanders in relation to one another. Type 4 *hetairoi* are simply whichever warriors follow a leader. Except for Type 2 (against which see Chapter 2), this taxonomy is not so much inaccurate as misleading: the subtypes are simply sets of individuals whose immediate relationship is determined by the narrative context, not by the fourfold nature of *hetaireia*.

¹¹ For proto-hoplite warfare in military-historical treatments of Homer see e.g. Albracht 1886/1895; Lang 1910, 54-59; Murray 1960, 151; Webster 1964, 214-220; and most importantly Latacz 1977 (the first serious attempt to reconstruct Homeric warfare after Finley 1978, 74 dismissed Homer's battle narratives altogether; see especially notes on ideological 'distortion' at 26-45 and Homeric terms for *taxis* at 141-171), followed to varying degrees by Pritchett 1985, 7-33; Morris 1987, 171-210; van Wees 1986, 1988, 1992, 1994; Ulf 1990, 139-149; Hanson 1991, 80-81; Raaflaub 1997; Wheeler 2007, 192-195 (with further bibliography). Leimbach 1980 and Singor 1991 reject

reasons.¹² Philosophical discussions of ancient friendship include *hetairos* as one term of affection among many and do not treat warrior companionship separately.¹³ Specifically military companionship has occasionally been treated in broader discussions of the psychology of the Homeric warrior, but here the most insightful work comes from military psychology rather than

Latacz on both methodological (oral poetry represents too many time-periods) and interpretive (terms are more plastic than Latacz thinks) grounds, but see van Wees 1992, 10-23 for critique of Singor's analysis. Snodgrass 1993 tempers Latacz's chronology; Hellmann 2000 acknowledges virtues of both hoplite-like and sans-hoplite claims by distinguishing pre-battle formations (which sometimes resemble hoplite formations) from warriors in battle (whose degree of organization is depicted in variously, depending on poetic need), somewhat resembling Bowden 1993 (who prefers the concept 'levels of reality'). Sears 2010 attempts another kind of reconciliation by singling out Myrmidon combat as uniquely hoplite-like (insofar as Myrmidons resemble ants). For *hetairoi* in particular as hoplite-like see Garland 1975, 24; van Wees 1986 (who inaccurately treats the Myrmidons as representative of Iliadic military units in general) and 1988, 5-6 (confusing the mutual support offered by heroes and *hetairoi* with cohesion of persistent units); Singor 1995.

¹² For literary motivations to mix incompatible types of battle, see Snodgrass 1965, 111; Kirk 1968, 111; Krischer 1971, 13-89; Mueller 1984, 102ff; Bowden 1993, 52-59 (which folds hero cults into the 'levels of reality'); Udwin 1999; Hellmann 2000 (sympathizing with Morris 1986 in reading the distinction between mass and heroic combat as an elite response to *polis* ideology); Wheeler 2007, 193-195 (with bibliography); Raaflaub 2008, 2011. For hoplite-like masses as evidence of post-Homeric interpolation, see e.g. Webster 1958, 214-220; Murray 1960, 151; Kirk 1962, 186-188. The most intriguing attempt to reconcile massed and non-massed combat via comparative anthropology appears in van Wees 1994, but while the parallels are interesting the position advanced remains hypothetical. The typology of battle scenes surveyed in Fenik 1968 tells neither for nor against the historicity of the Homeric style of combat. Finley 1978, 75 remains the *locus classicus* for pessimism on the intelligibility of Homeric battle.

¹³ The literature on friendship in ancient Greece is too vast to survey here; see Konstan 1997, 174-176 for a bibliographical essay. For *hetairoi* in relation to *philoï*, see Konstan 1997, 31-33 (in Homer), 44-46 and 61-63 for *hetairoi* in later periods. I discuss differences between *hetaireia* and *philia*, with relevant bibliography, in the last section of Chapter 1.

ancient history or literary criticism.¹⁴ Indo-Europeanist work on warrior-bands (Männerbünde) is extensive but mostly inapplicable to Homer.¹⁵

¹⁴ Among ancient historians Hanson 1983 first applied the ‘face of battle’ approach (from Keegan 1976) to Greece and added aspects of the ‘buddy theory’, developed by psychologists during World War II and published immediately afterward (of which Marshall 1947 is the best known but fails to substantiate key claims; Stouffer 1949 is deeper, broader, and better researched; Shils and Janowitz 1948 is conceptually the most important, having introduced the psychoanalytic concept of the ‘primary group’). For a recent (thorough but opinionated) survey of ‘face of battle’ work in ancient history see Wheeler 2010. But Hanson’s picture of combat psychology is tightly linked to the (speculatively reconstructed) specifics of Greek hoplite (and later Roman manipular) warfare, and as a result has not much affected studies of Homeric battle. The only major exception is van Wees 1996, which includes a useful list of six ‘combat drives’ in Homer, including warrior companionship. Despite Hanson’s (possibly misapplied) appreciation of ‘buddy theory’, van Wees’ recognition of *hetaireia* as a ‘combat drive’, and the obvious importance of Achilles’ relationship with Patroclus to the Iliadic plot, general discussions of motivation in Homeric combat are still dominated by mythological, anthropological, and sociological accounts centering on *kleos* (e.g. Nagy 1979) and *time* (e.g. Adkins 1960; van Wees 1992; Cairns 1993; *sed contra* cf. scholion 1 on *Iliad* 22.381-90, describing Achilles: τὸ φιλέταιρον προτιθεῖς τοῦ φιλοτίμου). For a nuanced treatment of motivational complexity in the *Iliad* (with bibliographical survey) see Zanker 1994, 1-46; in general Zanker treats motives for cooperation with sophistication and awareness of the possibility of change over time, but does not treat motivation in military and non-military situations separately. Considerably richer are the penetrating works of military psychologist Jonathan Shay (1994 and 2002), which show how accurately the Homeric poems depict (post-traumatic) warrior psychology both in and after combat, including the particular kind of grief and rage caused by the death of a ‘special comrade’ in war (1994, chapter 3) and the loss of trust earned by commander who leads his men recklessly (2002, 236-241). The success of Shay’s work – both in these two books and in his practical use of the Homeric poems in psychotherapy for combat veterans – tells against the evaluation of Homeric psychology, widespread in European literary criticism since Coleridge, that Homer’s characters lack the “subjectivity of *persona*, or dramatic character, as in all Shakespeare’s great creations” (*Table Talk*, 12 May 1830; quoted in Finley 1978, 49). Most recently, Race 2014 discusses Homeric insights into the successful rehabilitation on Scheria of the traumatized Odysseus, observing how skillfully Alkinoos helps Odysseus communicate his anguish and reintegrate into a new community now that his *hetairoi* are dead.

¹⁵ The earliest systematic speculation on the Männerbünde appears in Schurtz 1902, according to Arvidsson 2006; but Schurtz was an ideological anthropologist, not an Indo-European specialist, and articulated his theory chiefly to rebut contemporary (predominantly British) theories on primitive matriarchy. The junction of thanatophilia and misogyny was first applied to ancient Greeks and Romans in Schroeder 1908 and linked with medieval German stories of Totenheer under Odin’s command in Weiser 1927 and Höfler 1934. Wikander 1938 demonstrated the existence of Indo-Iranian warrior-companionship. Inspired mainly by Wikander, Jeammaire 1968, Dumézil 1969, Sinos 1980, and Pinsent 1983 apply Männerbund-theory (lightly) to Homer, taking the Indo-European Männerbund as the type of which the group of Homeric *hetairoi* is a refinement, and Marrou 1948 even argues that Greek homosexuality in toto originated from relationships among warrior-companions. But Homeric *hetairoi* are not thematically parallel to these Germanic and Indo-Iranian warrior-bands. The Männerbünde are, on the one hand, figuratively dead via their special connection with Odin, and, on the other, associated with specifically canine destructive power through the term *berserkir* and various stories of skin-changing during combat. But Homeric warrior-bands have no such connection with any particular divinity, nor do they shape-shift or mutilate themselves. Again, death in Homer causes fear and *pathos*, both to extreme degrees; and deaths of *hetairoi* affect the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* precisely insofar as they elicit sorrow; but the Totenheer are beyond both *pathos* and fear because they are already dead. Again, when Homeric warriors are compared in similes with wild animals, the comparandum is usually a lion or a bull, presumably influenced by Near Eastern rather than Indo-European sources (e.g. the lupine Autolycus has a non-military role in the plot of the *Odyssey*; the Myrmidons are the only significant exception, as

None of these treatments considers philological, literary, psychological, military-historical, and social-historical aspects of *hetaireia* together. In 1969 Emile Benveniste suggested that deeper understanding of the word *hetairos* and of the relation signified thereby could be achieved only by a comprehensive study of the usage of *hetairos* in Homer. This dissertation responds to that suggestion.

Outline

Chapter 1: *Hetaireia* in the *Iliad*: Meaning, Activity, Nature

In the first chapter I examine *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* from philological, social-historical, and literary perspectives, seeking to uncover the meaning of the word *hetairos*, the actions of *hetairoi*, and the nature of *hetaireia* as a social bond. In the first section I treat the semantics of *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad*. I discuss the usage and reference of *heta(i)r-*, relying on a complete survey of all individuals called *hetairoi*; the adjectives that most commonly describe *hetairoi*; and the etymology of *heta(i)r-* (from the PIE reflexive **swe-*).

In the second section I proceed from meaning to activity. I draw on a comprehensive classification and analysis of what *hetairoi* do and what is done to or for them to discuss representative examples of the three most common activities associated with *hetairoi*, namely: to protect, to avenge, and to lament. These actions paint a picture of *hetaireia* consistent with the semantic analysis in the first section, with much scholarly reception of the *Iliad*, and with modern treatments of combat psychology.

they are described as wolves at *Iliad* 16.156-166). As Dumézil recognizes, Livy is a much better source than Homer for vestigia of the oldest Indo-European warrior ideology.

In the third section I discuss how Homer makes poetic use of *hetaireia* to heighten *pathos* at key moments in the *Iliad*. Two examples are discussed at length: Sarpedon's death scene, especially his speech to Glaukos, and the clustering of the term *pistos hetairos* around Patroclus' *aristeia* and death.

The fourth and final section of Chapter 1 contains a comparative analysis of Iliadic *hetaireia* in the context of other archaic social relations. I derive three basic attributes of *hetaireia* – bidirectionality, non-reciprocity, and asymmetry – and contrast *hetaireia* with *philia*, *xenia*, and the relation between the king/shepherd and the *laos/laoi*, arguing that *hetaireia* cannot be reduced to any of the other three relations.

Chapter 2: Groups of *Hetairoi* in the *Iliad*

The second chapter is about how *hetaireia* affects groups of warriors in the *Iliad*. In the first section I examine the phrase ἔθνος ἐταίρων, the standard term for groups of *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*, including the two formulae in which most instances of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων are embedded (ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο and στή δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων).

In the next section I shift from literary to organizational aspects of *hetaireia* in the warrior group, observing that *hetairoi* are absent from formal military structure and that commanders lead *hetairoi* by a mixture of exhortation, persuasion, and inspiration (usually signified by κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω) rather than authoritarian command and control. This section draws on a survey of all commands issued by humans in the *Iliad*.

In the final section I discuss three key instances of one-to-many *hetaireia*, relating the nature of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων and norms of Iliadic leadership to the successes and failures of Agamemnon, Hector, Achilles, and Patroclus as leaders of men in battle.

Chapter 3: Dissolution of *Hetaireia* in the *Odyssey*

In the third chapter I consider how *hetaireia* breaks down over the course of Odysseus' *Apologoi*. Beginning with the battle against the Cicones, I show how Odysseus and his *hetairoi* fail to treat one another as heroes and *hetairoi* treat one another in the *Iliad*. The result is a progressive erosion of trust between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*. As the *hetairoi* among the Lotus-eaters prove that they cannot be trusted to take care of themselves, so Odysseus on the Cyclopes' island proves that he cannot be trusted to take care of his *hetairoi*. The breakdown of *hetaireia* spirals out of control as each incident leaves either Odysseus or his *hetairoi* increasingly justified in not trusting the other.

I trace the breakdown of *hetaireia* through each incident in the *Apologoi*, but I more closely observe the progressive separation between Odysseus and *hetairoi* in three sequences. First, off the Ithacan shore (*Odyssey* 10.34-42) his *hetairoi* “speak among themselves” (πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον), suspect that Odysseus is keeping wealth from them, and ruin their homecoming by opening the bag of the winds. Second, in the Laestrygonian harbor, Odysseus hangs back alone (ἐγὼν οἶος) among “my *hetairoi*” (ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισιν) and flees in terror when the rest of his *hetairoi* are eaten (95-129). Finally, the *hetairos* Odysseus appoints as temporary commander on Aiaia (10.205) leads a mutiny off Thrinakia by appealing to the disastrous incident in the Cyclops' cave (12.278-283), and when Odysseus falls asleep the usurper quotes Odysseus' own address to the “*hetairoi* having suffered much” (κακά περ πάσχοντες ἐταῖροι) and leads the *hetairoi* to their complete self-destruction (12.339-352).

Chapter 4: Replacement of *Hetaireia* in the *Odyssey*

In the fourth chapter I examine what replaces *hetaireia* over the course of the *Odyssey*. Two observations are fundamental. First, none of Odysseus' associates after his return to Ithaca

are called *hetairoi*. His human supporters on Ithaca are kin (Telemachus, Laertes) and slaves (Eumaios, Philoitios, Dolios and sons); he does not need human *hetairoi* to defeat the suitors in battle. Second, Athena helps Odysseus, Telemachus, and Laertes primarily in the form of Mentor, introduced as Odysseus' *hetairos* (2.225) and repeatedly called his *hetairos* thereafter; is called *hetairos* to Odysseus on Scheria (8.200); and compares herself favorably to a mortal *hetairos* (20.45) when she appears to Odysseus as a god.

From these two observations I construct a new, post-Iliadic picture of *hetaireia* in two parts. First, I discuss *hetairoi* that do appear on Ithaca: sailors rowing Telemachus to and from Pylos and Sparta, suitors failing twice to form a military group, Odysseus' steward failing to protect the *oikos* from the suitors, and slaves helping Eumaios tend the sheep and attend to the stranger. All are either physically soft (suitors), gathered for a brief adventure and dispersed immediately thereafter (sailors), past their prime (Mentor and Halitherses, *patrioi hetairoi*), or unfree (slaves). Not only are these *hetairoi* not Iliadic warriors, but also they are incapable of forming a warrior-band.

Second, I consider what replaces Iliadic *hetaireia* after Thrinakia, now that warrior-*hetairoi* are dead and *hetairoi* are no longer warriors. While Iliadic *hetairoi* provide physical and moral support together, I find that, in the *Odyssey*, physical and moral support are split: slaves and kin fight for Odysseus physically, while Athena fights for Odysseus primarily by affecting morale. I discuss the replacement of *hetaireia* in two corresponding subsections. First, I discuss how Telemachus grows into a warrior-son, noting how quickly his conversation with Odysseus turns to tactics (16.233-269) and closely interpreting his appearance at Odysseus' side (21.431-434). I observe how quickly Laertes' reunion with Odysseus also becomes a council of war (24.352-355) and note that the last *hetairos* so called in the *Odyssey* is Laertes, whom Athena-

Mentor names as “dearest by far of all *hetairoi*” (πάντων πολὺ φίλταθ’ ἐταίρων) immediately before giving him the *menos* to cast the spear-throw that routs the suitors’ families (24.517-524).

In the last section of Chapter 4 I examine the presentation of Athena as *hetairos* throughout the *Odyssey*. I trace her progression of disguises from *Mentes xenos* (1.87) to Mentor *hetairos*, her favorite human appearance, introduced in a line that also closes book 24 (Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν). As she revives Odysseus’ spirits he feels her as his *hetairos*: when she praises Odysseus’ discus-throw on Scheria (8.193-200), Odysseus “rejoices to see a *hetairos* in the *agon*” (χαίρων οὖνεχ’ ἐταῖρον ἐνηέα λεῦσσε’ ἐν ἀγῶνι), even though he does not know the anonymous Phaeacian that praises him. When he feels afraid of the suitors as one against many, she berates him (20.45-48) because he would trust an inferior, mortal *hetairos* (χερείονι πείθεθ’ ἐταίρω / ὅς περ θνητός), and yet he does not trust the goddess who always protects him (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, διαμπερὲς ἢ σε φυλάσσω). Finally, when she appears as Mentor in the final two battles, *hetaireia* is twice named (22.208; 24.517), her first appearance as Mentor is quoted three times (24.548=24.503=22.206=2.268=2.401), and she inspires Laertes to kill Eupheithes in a speech that opens with the last appearance of *heta(i)r-* in the *Odyssey* (24.516-520).

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Postscript

A brief concluding chapter suggests how the analysis of *hetaireia* presented in this dissertation might affect Homeric studies, cultural, social, and military history of the archaic period, ancient philosophy, the history of psychology, and aspects of modern military psychology. I close with a prospective sketch of a future project on *hetaireia* and military companionship from archaic lyric through Alexander the Great, beginning with a cultural-historical trajectory outlined in the chapters on the *Odyssey*.

CHAPTER 1: *HETAIREIA* IN THE *ILIAD*: MEANING, ACTIVITY, NATURE

Introduction

In this chapter I examine *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* from philological, social-historical, and literary perspectives in order to uncover the meaning of the word *hetairos*, the actions of *hetairoi*, and the nature of *hetaireia* as a social bond. In the first section I offer a philological analysis of the *heta(i)r-* root, covering etymology (from the PIE reflexive **swe-*), descriptors (most commonly φίλος, ἐρίηρος, πιστός, ἐσθλός, ἀμφί), and a peculiarity of usage that parallels a well-known peculiarity of the usage of *phil-*: that *heta(i)r-* modifies warriors only when they are acting or being perceived as *hetairoi*. After establishing what *heta(i)r-* means, I consider what Iliadic *hetairoi* do, finding that, in most cases, *hetairoi* give or receive protection, vengeance, and lament, almost always in a military context. These two sections, supported by an appendix detailing all actions of *hetairoi* and the most common descriptors of *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad*, establish the semantic and normative foundation of *hetaireia* in Homer.

After this introduction to the semantics of *heta(i)r-*, I turn in the third section to the literary role of *hetaireia* in the Iliadic narrative. I find that the primary literary use of *hetaireia* is to create *pathos* at the death of the hero and/or the *hetairos*, and that Homer builds *pathos* by making poetic use of both the semantics of *heta(i)r-* and the characteristic actions of *hetairoi* in battle. I support this conclusion with detailed discussion of two examples. First, to illustrate the *pathos* of *hetaireia* in battle, I consider the relationship of the Lykian hero Sarpedon and his *hetairos* Glaucus, interpreting their actions mainly through Sarpedon's death speech, which

begins as the hero “names his dear *hetairos*” (*Iliad* 16.491: φίλον δ’ ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον). Second, I find that Homer heightens the *pathos* of Patroclus’ death by associating the *peith/pist* root with the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus throughout the *Iliad*, especially Books 1, 9, and 11, then modifying *hetairos* with the adjective *pistos* only in the section of the poem that surrounds Patroclus’ death (Books 15-18).

The fourth section derives three general attributes of *hetaireia* from the examples discussed earlier and tabulated in the appendix. I find that Iliadic *hetaireia* is non-reciprocal (that is, if X is *hetairos* of Y, then Y is not *hetairos* of X; the only exception is the case of Achilles and Patroclus), asymmetrical (that is, if X is *hetairos* of Y, then X is physically weaker than Y, in every case in which relative strength is clear from the text; again the exceptional case is that of Achilles and Patroclus), and bidirectional (that is, warriors who are not called *hetairoi* both give and receive protection, vengeance, and lament to and from warriors who are called *hetairoi* in relation to them).

After concluding these discussions of the meaning of *heta(i)r-*, the actions of *hetairoi*, the literary use of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*, and the general attributes of *hetaireia* as a social relation, I focus in the final section on the nature of *hetaireia* in comparison with other archaic social relations: *philia*, *xenia*, and the relation between the king/shepherd and the *laos/laoi*. I distinguish *hetaireia* from each other archaic relationship in multiple ways specific to that relationship. Finally, I use the three attributes of *hetaireia*, which together characterize *hetaireia* and none of the archaic relations named, to argue that Iliadic *hetaireia* is not reducible to any of the other three relations.

1. *Heta(i)r-*: etymology, reference, descriptors

1.1 Etymology

All modern linguistic authorities agree that *heta(i)r-* derives from PIE **swe-*.¹ But the original meaning of **swe-* is still a matter of controversy. Indo-European reflexes of **swe-* include anaphoric pronouns, sometimes third-person but usually reflexive; possessive adjectives, which may derive from the reflexive; and terms for affine kinship, whose meaning can also be derived from a reflexive or possessive sense. Linguists have not agreed on how to relate these diverse syntactic and semantic attributes either synchronically or diachronically.²

¹ Frisk 1960, *s.v.*; Chantraine 1968 *s.v.*; Benveniste 1973 book 3, chapter 3; Gates 1971, 29-31; Pinsent 1983; Beekes 2009 *s.v.*, correcting an earlier view (Miller 1953, Benveniste 1973) that also derives Homeric *ἑτης* from **swe-*, meaning ‘kinsman’, usually in the extended sense of ‘clansman’; the *-της* was taken as an agentive or participatory ending, as in *polites* (yielding an etymological sense ‘member of the self-group’), but *ἑτης* must have begun only with a digamma.

² Following Brugmann and Delbruck 1893, most linguists have taken **swe-* as a reflexive root (Benveniste 1973 *s.v.*; Watkins 1976; Shields 1998). Hahn 1963, however, argues, mainly from Latin examples, that **swe-* is not reflexive, but rather simply anaphoric (i.e. refers to another nominal element in the sentence, but not necessarily the subject), because **swe-* derivatives sometimes refer to nouns other than the subject. Hahn addresses simply one instance of the non-reflexive interpretation of **swe-* (namely, Latin *se*, *suus*). But this instance cannot be taken as evidence for original PIE non-reflexivity because third-person pronouns in Indo-European daughter languages work in notoriously diverse ways: see Meyer 1997. Moreover, Latin is not unique in using reflexives not characterized by coreferentiality between subject and object; see Wiesemann 1986, 443-450 (noting that many languages include special, non-reflexive pronouns or verbal affixes to indicate coreferentiality). Hahn’s arguments have not received general acceptance – partly because many of her examples are poetic, and partly because the scope of her evidence is limited. (For the breadth of Latin reflexives see Shields 1998, 124-125.) Petit 1999, using mostly Greek examples, more rigorously explains away Hahn’s Latin examples by distinguishing **se-* from **swe-* precisely as merely anaphoric from specifically reflexive (157-159). But as Puddu 2007 observes, reflexive pronouns in Vedic, Avestan, and Hittite sources derive from **se-*, not **swe-*, while **s(e)we-* appears to have functioned as a possessive adjective, thereby dismissing Petit’s Greek evidence as too late to resolve the general PIE debate. For bibliographical survey of literature on **swe-* see Shields 1998, 121-125. In some cases **swe-* refers to the theme of the sentence, rather than the grammatical subject, as in Sanskrit *svá-* (Vine 1997), or the “individual whose speech, thoughts or feelings are being reported” (Shields 1998, 125), as in Latin *se*. But the Rig Veda folds the PIE **swe-* into a more complex system with younger, Indo-Iranian reflexives based on nouns for the body (including *ātmán-*). Such a system encourages semantic differentiation, which makes the specific meaning of *svá-* difficult to apply to the interpretation of **swe-* reflexes in other languages. But some suggestively ‘subjective’ uses of **s(e)we-* do recur elsewhere. For **sewe-* as reflexive adjective meaning ‘one’s own’ see Lehmann 1974, 128, 207. For deeper links between notions of self, reflexivity, and grammatical and psychological subjectivity in Indo-European languages (albeit focusing on Germanic languages) see Steiner and Wright 1995. For affine (non-consanguineous) kinship signified by **swe-* see Benveniste 1973, book 2, chapter 5; Puddu 2007, 256f. Reflexives indicating general kinship include Old English *sibb* (kinsman), *swān* (herdsman), Old High German *sippa* (kinship, family), German *Sippe* (kinship, family), Old Norse *sveinn* (boy, servant), Latin *sodalis*, English *ethnic* (which is more specialized than the Greek). More specific relationships may be signified by **swe-sor* (whence *sister*, *Schwester*) and **swe-kuros*

Nevertheless, two features of the Iliadic usage of *heta(i)r-* are consistent with the derivation from **swe*. First: in the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* are warriors called *hetairoi* because of their relation to other warriors in battle. A survey of all instances of *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad*, summarized in the appendix, shows that *hetairoi* relate to the Iliadic warrior-self in two ways: physically, insofar as warriors are called *hetairoi* when they support one another in battle; and psychologically, insofar as warriors are called *hetairoi* when they are perceived as actually or potentially supportive in battle. Warriors are not called *hetairos* unless they are related to a nearby warrior who is providing, wishes to provide, or soon will provide protection, vengeance, or lament (or vice versa).

Second: in every determinable case but one, the warrior to whom someone is called *hetairos* is not himself called *hetairos* to that warrior; and the warrior not called *hetairos* is physically stronger than the warrior called *hetairos* to him.³ Thus the warrior is called *hetairos* in relation to the hero, the weaker referred to the stronger, in the context of battle, as an individual in a sentential context is named by a reflexive pronoun or adjective in relation to the subject or theme of the sentence. But the *hetairos* is no less motivationally important than the stronger hero, in the sense that the name whereby the narrative designates nearby warriors does not determine whether or not other warriors fight, kill, or risk their lives for them in battle. The name *hetairos* suggests a difference in focus but not in affection.

1.2 Descriptors

(parents-in-law, whence *hekyra* and *socrus*), but these derivations are still speculative; see Friedrich 1966, updated in Hettrich 1985 and more recently (and skeptically) Kullanda 2002.

³ The sole exception is the case of Achilles and Patroclus, each of whom is called *hetairos* of the other. I discuss this exceptional case in Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

The words Homer uses to describe *hetairoi* paint a more precise picture than does the etymology. The adjectives that most commonly modify *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad* are φίλος (23 times), πιστός (7 times),⁴ ἐσθλός (7 times), and ἐρίηρος (6 times). If we include prepositions that retain a spatial sense, ἀμφί becomes the second most common descriptor (14 times).

Unlike the other adjectives in this list, which modify diverse nouns both in and after Homer, the meaning of ἐρίηρος cannot be deduced with certainty, nor can the meaning of ἐρίηρος be used to derive the meaning of *hetairos* without circularity, because ἐρίηρος always modifies *hetairos* in the *Iliad*. But one semantic clue is available in the *Odyssey*, and many more suggestions appear in the scholarly tradition.

At *Odyssey* 1.346, Telemachus calls Phemius “ἐρίηρον ἀοιδόν,” as he rebukes his mother for berating the singer. The rhetoric of the passage suggests that Telemachus is describing Phemius as ἐρίηρος in contradiction to the accusation implied by Penelope’s rebuke – so ἐρίηρος here must mean something good and innocent of blame.⁵ The context is otherwise unhelpful. Scholion E interprets ἐρίηρος in this passage as an indicator of Phemius’ musical skill, but the etymology adduced (from ἁρμόζω) is probably incorrect.

⁴ But πιστός modifies *hetairos* only in connection with Patroclus’ entry into battle, and in all cases but one modifies a *hetairos* who dies in the same passage. Thus Homer seems to use πιστός in the *Iliad* with specifically literary intent, as I discuss later in this chapter.

⁵ LSJ glosses ἐρίηρος in this passage as “loyal,” although Penelope says only that Phemius’ song causes her pain, not that it is disloyal to sing of the return of the Achaeans from Troy (*Odyssey* 1.337-344).

The scholia offer glosses more precise than mere positive evaluation: ἐρίηρος means “fitted close” and “lovely,” folk-etymologizing from ἄρω⁶, ἀρμόζω⁷, ἄρσιος⁸, ἐράω⁹, εὐάρμοστος¹⁰, and ἐπέραστος¹¹ and glossing as “beneficial” (μεγαλωφελής), “good” (ἀγαθός), “strong” (ἰσχυρός)¹², “earnest” (σπουδαῖος)¹³, “advantageous” (ἐπιτήδειος)¹⁴, and “dear” (φίλος)¹⁵. The overlap with *philia* is specified more narrowly in one scholion on the *Odyssey* that explains ἐρίηρας ἐταῖρους as “dear on account of need” (τοὺς διὰ τὰς χρείας φίλους).¹⁶ Eustathius accepts “very fitted together” (ἄγαν ἀρηρότεες)¹⁷, “lovely” (ἐραστοί¹⁸, ἐράσμιος¹⁹),

⁶ Scholion b on *Iliad* 3.47; Geneva manuscript on 3.47.

⁷ Scholion b on *Iliad* 3.47; Geneva manuscript *ad loc* also describes these *hetairoi* as ‘gathered together’ (συναθροίσας). Scholion E on *Odyssey* 1.346 (..ἐρίηρον αἰδόν..) cites ἀρμόζω as appropriate to the man who plays the *kithara* very skillfully; it is unclear how much this passage influenced the scholarly interpretation of ἐρίηρος in non-musical contexts.

⁸ Scholion T on *Iliad* 24.365, a little indirectly (<ἀνάρσιος> ἐναντίοι τῶν ἐριήρων).

⁹ Scholion T on *Iliad* 3.47, further glossed as χάρις (also offered as gloss in Geneva manuscript *ad loc*).

¹⁰ Geneva manuscript on *Iliad* 3.47; scholion D on *Iliad* 3.378 and 4.266.

¹¹ Geneva manuscript on *Iliad* 3.47.

¹² These three adjectives are offered as synonyms in scholion V on *Odyssey* 8.62.

¹³ Scholion D on *Iliad* 3.378.

¹⁴ Scholion D on *Iliad* 4.266.

¹⁵ *Passim*.

¹⁶ Scholia vetera, scholion 6 on *Odyssey* 1.236, repeated on 1.238. This insight is remarkable: as will be seen below, warriors in the *Iliad* are consistently called *hetairoi* when they act or are felt as *hetairoi*: that is, when they are needed as *hetairoi* either physically or psychologically.

¹⁷ *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.603.26; 2.669.15.

¹⁸ *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.603.26.

¹⁹ *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.744.9, but he immediately emphasizes that ἐρίηρος does not mean *only* “very lovely” but rather, and even more so, means “closely attached” (ιστέον δέ, ὅτι ἐρίηρος ἐταῖρος οὐ μόνον ὁ ἄγαν ἐράσμιος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλιστα ὁ ἄγαν ἀραρῶς καὶ ἡρμοσμένος τῷ φίλῳ καὶ μὴ δυαζόμενος).

“suitable” (ἄρεστός)²⁰, “fitted” (ἀραρίσκω, ἀρμόζω²¹), “helpful” (ἄρος, ὄφελος)²² and twice defines ἐρίηρες as “*hetairoi* fitted to *philia*.”²³ There is even a bit of metaphysical speculation: Eustathius further explains his gloss on ἐρίηρος as “fitted to a *philos*” (ἡρμοσμένος τῷ φίλῳ) with “not acting as two” (μὴ δυαζόμενος).²⁴

Thus on the purely lexical ground of collocations in the *Iliad*, the *hetairos* is “dear” (φίλος), “trusty” (πιστός), “noble” (ἐσθλός), “nearby” (ἀμφί), and possibly (based on ancient commentary) “fitted close” or “lovely” (ἐρίηρος). This set is consistent with the etymological sense derived from **swe-*, but the Homeric descriptors are more informative. They emphasize the subjective aspect of *hetaireia* insofar as each of these descriptors, except perhaps ἐσθλός,²⁵ is meaningful from the perspective of the individual to whom someone is *hetairos*.²⁶

2. Actions of *hetairoi*

Etymology and descriptors suggest a general meaning of *heta(i)r-*, but the social and military significance of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* is determined by what *hetairoi* do and by what is

²⁰ *Commentary on the Iliad* 2.669.15, comparing πρόσαρμα (carried food) as nourishment attached as if a graft (προσφύῃς).

²¹ *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.744.9; *Commentary on the Odyssey* 1.65.41

²² *Commentary on the Odyssey* 1.65.41

²³ *Commentary on the Odyssey* 1.65.41 (μετηνέχθη δὲ καὶ εἰς φιλίαν, ὅθεν ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι λέγονται) and 1.308.36 (ἐρίηρες οἱ πρὸς φιλίαν ἡρμοσμένοι ἐταῖροι).

²⁴ *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.744.9. LSJ glosses Eustathius’ use of δυάζω in this one instance as “expressed in the dual number” but the term is not chiefly grammatical, even in Eustathius (e.g. *Commentary on the Iliad* 1.226.7, 3.21.7, 3.320.14, 3.459.1, etc.). The word can also mean ‘divide in two’ and ‘distinguish one from another’, although later it seems to mean ‘speak nonsense’ or ‘tell lies’. We might express this concept as ‘one plus’, i.e., as a generative rather than descriptive theory of the number two – a sense that captures Iliadic *hetaireia* remarkably well.

²⁵ For *esthlos* as descriptive against *pistos* as relational see Roisman 1983, 20.

²⁶ This kind of subjectivity is sometimes also implied by the Indo-European reflexive: see Shields 1998, 125, with broader context in Steiner and Wright 1995.

done to, for, or about them. Actions connected with *hetaireia* fall into three main classes: protection, vengeance, and lament. In the *Iliad*, warriors called *hetairoi* give or receive protection in 51 passages and lament or are lamented in 30 passages.²⁷ Discrete acts of vengeance cannot be counted because virtually everything Achilles does between Books 18 and 22 is done for the sake of revenge. Other related activities of *hetairoi* include fighting alongside other warriors, where protection is not specified as the immediate objective (15 passages), and simply killing in the heat of battle (13 passages).²⁸

Complete tabulation of all actions of *hetairoi* is included in the appendix. Representative examples of the three main types of action – protect, avenge, and lament – are discussed below.

2.1 Actions of *hetairoi* I: protection

2.1.1 Protecting warriors seen as *hetairoi*

Homer uses the word ‘ἑταῖρος’ to convey the relationship between beleaguered warriors and nearby warriors who come to their aid. The most vivid example appears in Book 16, when a group of Lykian warriors killed by Patroclus is described as “ἀμυτροχίτωνας ἑταίρους” as soon as Sarpedon sees their plight. The passage comes at the height of Patroclus’ *aristeia*, and the poetic use of *hetaireia* serves to convey both Patroclus’ force and Sarpedon’s care for his men:

²⁷ Protect: 3.32; 4.413; 4.523; 4.532; 5.574; 5.663-664; 5.692-693; 5.694-695; 6.6; 7.115; 8.332; 8.537; 10.151-152; 10.355; 10.522; 11.461; 11.585; 11.595; 12.122-123; 12.334; 13.165; 13.210-212; 13.213; 13.419; 13.421-423; 13.566; 13.596; 13.648; 14.408; 14.428-429; 15.95; 15.240-241; 15.591; 16.240; 16.248; 16.290-292; 16.512; 16.560-561; 16.817; 17.114; 17.129; 17.273; 17.466; 17.500; 17.532; 17.581; 17.636; 17.702; 18.102; 18.251; 22.240. Lament: 4.154; 9.56; 9.210; 17.459; 18.80; 18.98-99; 18.102; 18.128-129; 18.233-234; 18.235-236; 18.317; 18.343; 19.315; 19.345; 20.29; 22.390; 23.5; 23.6; 23.18; 23.37; 23.134; 23.137; 23.152; 23.178; 23.224; 23.252; 24.3-4; 24.51; 24.591; 24.792-794.

²⁸ Fighting alongside: 4.266-267; 4.373; 5.514; 11.91; 13.456; 13.477; 13.489; 13.709-710; 13.767; 15.501; 15.671; 16.170; 16.268; 16.268; 17.117. Killing: 10.560; 11.93; 12.379; 15.249; 15.330; 15.434; 15.446; 15.518-519; 17.204; 17.344-345; 17.577; 17.589; 24.755.

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' Ἑρύμαντα καὶ Ἀμφοτερὸν καὶ Ἐπάλτην

Τληπόλεμόν τε Δαμαστορίδην Ἐχίον τε Πύριν τε

Ἴφέα τ' Εὐϊππὸν τε καὶ Ἀργεάδην Πολύμηλον

πάντας ἐπασσυτέρους πέλασε χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ.

Σαρπηδὼν δ' ὥς οὖν ἴδ' ἀμιτροχίτωνας ἑταίρους

χέρσ' ὑπο Πατρόκλοιο Μενoitιάδαο δαμέντας,

κέκλετ' ἄρ' ἀντιθέοισι καθαπτόμενος Λυκίοισιν·

αἰδῶς ὧ Λύκιοι· πόσε φεύγετε; νῦν θοοὶ ἔστε.

(*Iliad* 16.415-422)

The first four lines (415-418) convey both violence and *pathos* in a typical Homeric enumeration of casualties.²⁹ The focus is Patroclus; the named Lykian victims, who are not major heroes, serve to show his killing power. The second four lines (419-422) shift both focus and point of view to Sarpedon, who responds when he sees his *hetairoi* dying at Patroclus' hands. When Lykians are being killed, they are named individually; when they are seen through Sarpedon's

²⁹ For particulars in Iliadic death scenes see Beye 1964; Fenik 1968; Armstrong 1969 (arguing on page 30 that “the relatives must have been informed, judging by the frequent insertion of their names and family particulars,” although judging from tone the article seems oddly tongue-in-cheek); Garland 1981 (typology of divine and human agency in death, especially with respect to the word *ker*; many useful tables of metaphorical and biological descriptions of death); Morrison 1999 (technical aspects of presentation, particularly sense-impressions evoked; metaphorical and logical language; literary function of Iliadic death-scenes; all in order to appreciate the “inventiveness” and “resourcefulness” of Homer's description of death). The authoritative treatment of injury and death in the *Iliad* remains Friedrich 1956 (including correction and refinement of the famous list of wounds in Frölich 1879), translated into English in 2003 and updated with an appendix by a modern physician (with bibliography on the medical accuracy of the *Iliad*). Griffin 1976 offers an excellent survey of Homeric *pathos*, especially the ‘objectivity’ of death-scenes generated by both clinical precision and individual naming, with many observations from ancient commentators.

eyes (ἴδ'), they are called *hetairoi*. Sarpedon responds first by rallying the Lykians, telling them to stand fast and be swift (θοοὶ ἔσθε). Then, in the lines following this passage, Sarpedon himself attacks Patroclus (423-479). Sarpedon's counterattack redirects Patroclus' attention away from the Lykian *hetairoi* and toward Sarpedon himself; and in the ensuing battle Patroclus kills him (480-507). Sarpedon's death, the zenith of Patroclus' *aristeia*, is thus occasioned by Sarpedon's desire to protect his *hetairoi*, even to the point of death. The Homeric audience is prepared for Patroclus' greatest victory (and Zeus' greatest sorrow) by seeing the *hetairoi* he kills through Sarpedon's eyes.³⁰

2.1.2 Exhorting warriors to protect an endangered *hetairos*

Warriors not only fight for their *hetairoi*, but also fight better when they are reminded of *hetaireia*. Desire to protect *hetairoi* inspires warriors to fight with greater strength and spirit (μένος καὶ θυμός). In exhortations, appeal to *hetaireia* is stronger than appeal to less affectively charged descriptions of the army. In Book 5, the war god himself begins a rousing speech by mentioning the objective danger to the *laos* but ends with an appeal to save Aeneas the *hetairos*:

ὦ υἱεῖς Πριάμοιο διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος

ἐς τί ἔτι κτείνεσθαι ἐάσετε λαὸν Ἀχαιοῖς;

ἦ εἰς ὃ κεν ἅμφι πύλης εὖ ποιητῆσι μάχωνται;

κεῖται ἀνὴρ ὃν ἴσον ἐτίομεν Ἔκτορι δίῳ

Αἰνείας υἱὸς μεγαλήτορος Ἀγχίσαιο·

ἀλλ' ἄγετ' ἐκ φλοίσβοιο **σαώσομεν ἐσθλὸν ἐταῖρον.**

³⁰ Sarpedon evidently cares for many Lykian *hetairoi*. His bond with his *hetairos* Glaucus is particularly strong, but the effect of his death-bed speech to Glaucus is magnified by his relationships with other *hetairoi* throughout the *Iliad*. See discussion under "The *pathos* of *hetaireia* I: the death of Sarpedon" below.

᾽Ως εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου.

(*Iliad* 5.464-470)

The beginning of the speech is an appeal to *aidos*. Ares addresses the Trojan commanders as “sons of the god-nourished king Priam” (υἱεῖς Πριάμοιο διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος) and asks them whether they will let the army (*laos*) be killed by Achaeans (ἐς τί ἔτι κτείνεσθαι ἔασετε λαὸν Ἀχαιοῖς;), thus juxtaposing the commanders’ noble lineage with their present failure to protect the troops. Ares’ initial description of Aeneas draws the hero closer to the addressees: like the Trojans commanders, Aeneas is son of a great man (υἱὸς μεγαλήτορος Ἀγχίσαο). But the actual exhortation to protect Aeneas describes him as “noble *hetairos*” (σαώσομεν ἐσθλὸν ἑταῖρον). As opposed to the *laos*, whose destruction earns only shame, the *hetairos* is specifically the warrior who needs to be saved, no further appeal to shame necessary. The speech is successful: Ares rouses the strength and spirit of each warrior (᾽Ως εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου).

2.1.3 Expecting protection from any *hetairoi*

As heroes protect *hetairoi*, so *hetairoi* protect heroes – reliably enough that warriors expect protection from whichever *hetairoi* happen to be nearby. The clearest example of a general appeal to *hetairoi* for protection occurs in *Iliad* 11, after Hector re-enters battle with Zeus’ support (185-212) and drives the Achaeans away from the city (285-350). After Diomedes injures Hector (350-360) and Paris wounds Diomedes, forcing him to withdraw (370-400), Odysseus remains in battle alone, surrounded by ranks of Trojans (ἐπὶ Τρώων στίχες ἦλυθον ἀσπιστάων / ἔλσαν δ’ ἐν μέσσοισι: 412-413). He kills many enemies but eventually is wounded by Socus (435-437). Socus pays with his life, but Odysseus bleeds profusely, still surrounded, and calls to *hetairoi* for help:

αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ ἐξοπίσω ἀνεχάζετο, αἶε δ’ ἑταίρους.

τρὶς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἥϋσεν ὅσον κεφαλὴ χάδε φωτός,

τρὶς δ' ἄϊεν ἰάχοντος ἄρηι φίλος Μενέλαος.

αἶψα δ' ἄρ' Αἴαντα προσεφώνεεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα·

(*Iliad* 11.461-464)

Odysseus knows of no heroes nearby; the preceding three hundred lines have seen to that. Three times he calls as powerfully as a human can (τρὶς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἥϋσεν ὅσον κεφαλὴ χάδε φωτός), directing his cry to *hetairoi* in general (αἶε δ' ἐταίρους). From Odysseus' point of view, *hetairoi* are not particular individuals, but rather any warriors who might respond to his cry for help. Odysseus' tactical assessment is sound, for his voice is barely audible: it takes three calls to catch Menelaus' ear (τρὶς δ' ἄϊεν ἰάχοντος). But when Menelaus does hear Odysseus' cry, he transmits the request to Ajax, who happens to be nearby (ἐγγύς). The two save Odysseus by killing many Trojans and remove him from battle. When Odysseus calls to *hetairoi*, he calls to nobody in particular; but nearby warriors do indeed come to his rescue.

2.1.5 Risking the army in order to save any of the *hetairoi*

Desire to protect *hetairoi* can override good tactical judgment. In Book 12, the Achaean army leaves the gates open for any of the *hetairoi* fleeing Hector's onslaught, at grave danger to the entire expedition. The passage describes what the Trojan ally Asius sees as he pursues the routed Achaeans:

τῇ ρ' ἵππους τε καὶ ἄρμα διήλασεν, οὐδὲ πύλησιν

εὗρ' ἐπικεκλιμένας σανίδας καὶ μακρὸν ὀχῆα,

ἀλλ' ἀναπεπταμένους ἔχον ἄνδρες, εἴ τιν' ἐταίρων

ἐκ πολέμου φεύγοντα σωῶσαι μετὰ νῆας.

(*Iliad* 12.120-123)

Two men are actively holding the gates open (ἀναπεπταμένους ἔχον ἄνδρες) even as Asius' chariot approaches. This move is extremely risky: only this wall protects the Achaeans from Hector's assault, and when Asius sees the open gates he expects an easy victory (125-126). Against the tactical need to close the gates to enemy attack, the Achaeans weigh the safety of "any of the *hetairoi*" (τιν' ἑταίρων / ἐκ πολέμου φεύγοντα σωῶσαι) and decide in favor of keeping the gates open for the retreating *hetairoi*. The decision receives narrative emphasis by confounding expectations: lines 120-121 express that the gates were *not* closed and *not* fastened, as anyone (including Asius) would expect in the present situation. Moreover, the army makes this decision spontaneously. At this point in the rout, no Achaean is in command. The Achaeans all together have decided to risk the camp in order to protect their retreating *hetairoi*.

2.1.5 Poetically leveraging the expectation that *hetairoi* will protect a wounded warrior

The expectation that *hetairoi* will protect a wounded warrior is strong enough that Homer uses it to magnify the terror of Patroclus' entry into battle. The first emotion described within Patroclus' *aristeia* is the Trojans' fear: the ranks quiver in terror at what they imagine is Achilles in his rage (*Iliad* 16.280-282). Patroclus' first kill is Pyraikhes, leader of the Paionians; and his *hetairoi* do nothing but stand around in fear:

τὸν βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον· ὃ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν κονίῃσι

κάππεσεν οἰμώξας, ἑταροὶ δέ μιν ἀμφεφόβηθεν

Παῖονες· ἐν γὰρ Πάτροκλος φόβον ἤκεν ἅπασιν...

(*Iliad* 16.289-291)

The *hetairoi* are expected to do something about the death of their commander. The adversative δέ suggest that it is surprising that they should merely stand around in fear (ἀμφοφόβηθεν). The fear named twice in explanation (ἀμφοφόβηθεν and φόβον) magnifies the sense of Patroclus' power. The poetic depiction of Patroclus' onslaught depends on the strength of the expectation that *hetairoi* will help a hero in distress – an expectation that only supreme force can override.³¹

2.2 Actions of *hetairoi* II: vengeance

When *hetairoi* are not protected successfully, the normal Iliadic response is revenge. Besides Achilles' revenge for Patroclus, Iliadic warriors avenge dead warriors immediately named *hetairoi* on five separate occasions, counting only revenge for warrior-companions named *hetairoi* in the same passage.³² Because most acts of vengeance (whether or not the warrior avenged is named *hetairos* in the same passage) occur in Books 15 through 17, the general theme of revenge for dead *hetairoi* seems to be constructed partly in order to magnify Achilles' revenge for Patroclus.

2.2.1 Earning death by killing *hetairoi*

³¹ The rhetorical technique of confounding an expectation to convey the overwhelming force of an attacker is most familiar from *Iliad* 22, where in spite of his best efforts trembling (τρόμος) seizes Hector when he sees Achilles, and he runs (Ἔκτορα δ', ὡς ἐνόησεν, ἔλε τρόμος· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη / αὖθι μένειν, ὀπίσω δὲ πύλας λίπε, βῆ δὲ φοβηθείς; *Iliad* 22.136-137).

³² Teucer: 15.436-441; Automedon: 17.466-473; Lycomedes/Apisaon/Asteropaios: 17.344-355; Hector: 17.576-592; Poulydamas: 15.445-457. Note that most of these avengers are also major heroes. The exception (Lycomedes/Apisaon/Asteropaios) occurs during the fight for Patroclus' corpse, a scene charged with preparation for Achilles' revenge. The appendix includes cases of revenge for dead warrior-companions even when those companions are not called *hetairoi*.

Achilles most clearly expresses the principle that enemies must pay with their lives for killing *hetairoi*. He closes his first speech to Hector by telling him exactly why he must die:

οὐ τοι ἔτ' ἔσθ' ὑπάλυξις, ἄφαρ δέ σε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη

ἔγχει ἐμῷ δαμάα· νῦν δ' ἄθροα **πάντ' ἀποτίσεις**

κῆδε' ἐμῶν ἐτάρων οὓς ἔκτανες ἔγχει θύων.

(*Iliad* 22.270-272)

The death of Patroclus is Achilles' primary reason to kill Hector in the broader Iliadic context, but the fact that Hector has killed Achilles' *hetairoi* in general (ἐμῶν ἐτάρων οὓς ἔκτανες) is enough to earn death at Achilles' hands. The speech emphasizes both the inexorability of *hetaireia* and the magnitude of Achilles' rage. Before Patroclus' death, Achilles and Thetis had often used *τίνω* to describe the price Agamemnon must pay for offending Achilles. In book 1, *tisis* responded to a serious offence, but the offense kept Achilles' killing power out of battle. Here “ἀποτίσεις” names a response to the killing of Achilles' *hetairoi* and this *tisis* is the culmination of Achilles' killing power in the *Iliad*. The battle-fury that comes from avenging a dead *hetairos* is far more terrible than the rage that comes from slighted honor.³³

³³ For Achilles' two rages see Most 2003. Achilles' battle-fury is never called *menis*, and indeed his entry into battle is preceded by an ‘unsaying’ of his *menis* toward Agamemnon (*Iliad* 19.75: μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος); yet his rage toward Hector is far more terrible than his rage toward Agamemnon. If *menis* is taken simply as an extreme form of rage, then this might seem surprising; but if *menis* is taken more specifically as divine rage resulting from a violation of cosmic hierarchy (e.g. Watkins 1977; Considine 1985; Muellner 1996), and if the military hierarchy is analogous to (and therefore enforced with responses analogous to) the cosmic hierarchy, then *menis* is more appropriate to Achilles' less terrible response. But if Achilles' second rage is viewed through the lens of *hetaireia*, then the most terrible actions of the *Iliad* come not from an individual sleight but simply from desire to avenge a dead *hetairos* – which is a different sort of fury altogether. Moreover, the image of fire, which attaches to Achilles from Book 16 through the end of his *aristeia* (Whitman 1958), signifies a fury that catches a warrior from the outside, almost passively (like grief-driven desire for vengeance for a dead *hetairos*), more precisely than it signifies a fury that begins inside the warrior as an active response (like offense taken at a rule-breaking reappportionment). For all forms of anger in Homer see Walsh 2005.

2.2.2 Revenge for a warrior known only as *hetairos*

The death of a warrior called *hetairos* can trigger a vengeful rampage even when nothing is known about the dead warrior except that he is someone's *hetairos*. In Book 15, as the Trojan attack approaches the Achaean ships, Poulydamas kills Otus the Kyllenian, mentioned nowhere else:

Πουλυδάμας δ' Ὀτον Κυλλήνιον ἐξενάριξε

Φυλεΐδεω [=Μέγης] ἔταρον, μεγαθύμων ἄρχὸν Ἐπειῶν.

τῷ δὲ Μέγης ἐπόρουσεν ἰδὼν· ὃ δ' ὕπαιθα λιάσθη

Πουλυδάμας...

(*Iliad* 15.518-521)

Poulydamas' victim is characterized only by name, origin, and relation to Meges, Phyleus' son (Φυλεΐδεω ἔταρον).³⁴ No further details about their relationship are necessary: Meges attacks as soon as he sees the killing (ἐπόρουσεν ἰδὼν). Poulydamas escapes, thanks to Apollo (521-522), so Meges begins a twenty-line revenge-*aristeia*, complete with two named victims (Kroismos at 523; Dolops at 542) and a back-story for the armor that saves his life (529-534). Desire to avenge a dead *hetairos* not only motivates Meges to kill, but also grants him narrative glorification as a hero.

2.2.3 Focusing on the killer of the *hetairos*

³⁴ Meges is named Phyleus' son in the Catalogue of Ships (τῶν αὐθ' ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ / Φυλεΐδης, ὃν τίκτε Διὶ φίλος ἱππότα Φυλεύς: *Iliad* 2.627-628).

Revenge for a dead *hetairos* can so dominate a hero's motivational structure that enemies hope that he wants nothing else. In Book 21, Achilles encounters the Trojan prince Lykaon, whom he had previously captured and ransomed. As he supplicates Achilles, Lykaon recounts their previous encounter and names the brothers Achilles has already killed, although he expects that none of these observations will prevent Achilles from killing him. But he makes one final attempt to ward off destruction:

νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐνθάδ' ἐμοὶ κακὸν ἔσσεται· οὐ γὰρ ὄϊω

σᾶς χεῖρας φεύξεσθαι, ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἐπέλασσε γε δαίμων.

ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσι·

μή με κτεῖν', ἐπεὶ οὐχ ὁμογάστριος Ἕκτορός εἰμι,

ὅς τοι ἑταῖρον ἔπεφνεν ἐνὲά τε κρατερόν τε.

(*Iliad* 21.92-96)

Lykaon offers only one argument: he has nothing to do with Hector. Not only did Lykaon not kill Achilles' *hetairos*, as Hector did; but Lykaon did not even come from the same womb. The argument presupposes that Achilles is specifically targeting the killer of his *hetairos* and the killer's close associates and therefore has no particular interest in killing other Trojans. The ploy does not work, of course, for Achilles still associates Lykaon with Hector as another of Priam's sons (περὶ δ' αὖ Πριάμοιό γε παίδων: 105), but Lykaon does at least earn a philosophical word of

pity and expression of solidarity-in-death from Achilles (99-113) – far more than Achilles gives Hector, the warrior who did kill his *hetairos*.³⁵

2.2.4 Alcimedon and Automedon: protect and avenge

Protection of one *hetairos* and revenge for another can reinforce one another. In Book 17, two Myrmidons, Alcimedon and Automedon, are caught in the Achaeans' initial retreat from Patroclus' corpse. The Trojans would have won the fight, but Zeus wants the body returned to Achilles. To accomplish this he breathes into Automedon enough *menos* to reverse his retreat. Automedon reverses the chariot in order to fight, although grieved for his *hetairos* (ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταῖρου: *Iliad* 17.459). But he cannot drive the chariot and fight at the same time. Alcimedon the *hetairos* sees Automedon's predicament and addresses him both protectively and sympathetically:

ὄψε δὲ δὴ μιν ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν

Ἀλκιμέδων υἱὸς Λαέρκεος Αἰμονίδαο·

στῇ δ' ὀπιθεν δίφροιο καὶ Αὐτομέδοντα προσηύδα·

Αὐτόμεδον, τίς τοί νυ θεῶν νηκερδέα βουλὴν

ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔθηκε, καὶ ἐξέλετο φρένας ἐσθλὰς;

οἷον πρὸς Τρῶας μάχεται **πρώτῳ ἐν ὀμίλῳ**

³⁵ This passage has become a touch-stone for scholarly discussion of morals in Homer; see e.g. Gould 1973, 80f (Lykaon abandons himself to Achilles' mercy; Achilles calls him *philos* after being reminded that they had shared food in the past); Taplin 1992, 200-224 (Lykaon accepts Achilles' logic); Cairns 1993, 113-119 (justified vengeance trumps even *aidos*), Zanker 1994, 104-105 (Achilles' grief trumps all other considerations); Naiden 2005, 131 (acceptance of supplication is optional).

μοῦνος· ἀτὰρ τοι ἑταῖρος ἀπέκτατο, τεύχεα δ' Ἑκτωρ

αὐτὸς ἔχων ὅμοισιν ἀγάλλεται Αἰακίδαο.

(*Iliad* 17.466-473)

Alcimedon, the *hetairos* (ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ... Ἀλκιμέδων) who comes to defend Automedon, the Myrmidon who cannot fight for himself, exhorts Automedon to fight to avenge Patroclus, the Myrmidon *hetairos* whom Hector has killed. Alcimedon observes that Automedon is alone in combat (πρώτῳ ἐν ὁμίλῳ / μοῦνος), notes that the killer of his *hetairos* Patroclus (τοι ἑταῖρος ἀπέκτατο) is currently vaunting in Achilles' armor, and suggests that the two Myrmidons join forces against him. Automedon listens and the two fight together as spearman and charioteer – the protecting *hetairos* forming a pair with another Myrmidon, alone until now, to avenge the death of another *hetairos*.³⁶ Myrmidon hero and *hetairos* do not kill Hector, but they do drive him off with the help of Menelaus and the two Ajaxes (513-540), who come to their defense at the cry of their *hetairos* (ἑταίρου κικλήσκοντος: 532).

2.2.5 Revenge for *hetairoi* and escalation

When a *hetairos* is killed, the strength of the *hetaireia* bond escalates the violence of the resulting revenge in two ways. The first kind of escalation remains on the human level: three times the killing of one *hetairos* is avenged by killing another, and so on. The second kind of escalation brings the gods into battle twice: first, Thetis persuades Hephaistos to make Achilles new armor in order to avenge his dead *hetairos*, and, second, Zeus unleashes the gods into battle

³⁶ For other paired warriors in the *Iliad* see van Wees 1986, 290n30.

when Achilles' vengeful rage over his dead *hetairos* threatens to destroy the walls of Troy "beyond fate" (ὑπέρμωρον).

2.2.5.1 Chains of vengeance for dead *hetairoi*

The killing of *hetairoi* produces a chain of vengeance in three cases, twice immediately and once eventually. The first case (*Iliad* 15.436-456) involves Lycophron, *hetairos* of Ajax and Teucer, whose death Ajax and Teucer avenge by killing Kleitos, and Poulydamas, to whom Kleitos was *hetairos*. The second case comes at *Iliad* 17.344-355, where Aeneas kills Leiokritos, *hetairos* of Lykomedes, whose death Lykomedes avenges by killing Apisaon.

The third vengeance-chain is more diffuse but by far the most important. Glaucus' desire to avenge Sarpedon is woven tightly into a sequence of vengeance-killings that begins with Patroclus' slaughter of Sarpedon's *hetairoi*, in a passage already discussed above (16.415-422). This passage touches off a sequence that begins with Sarpedon's counterattack, leading to his death at Patroclus' hands; continues through Patroclus' death at Hector's hands during the fight for the corpse of Hector's half-brother Kebriones, killed by Patroclus shortly after Sarpedon's death; and ends with Hector's death at Achilles' hands in revenge for killing Patroclus.

2.2.5.2 Divine sanction and mitigation of revenge for dead *hetairoi*

Vengeance for dead *hetairoi* receives explicit sanction from the gods. The gods respect warriors' desire to avenge dead *hetairoi* enough that Thetis offers only vengeance for Patroclus as sufficient reason for Hephaistos to make Achilles' new armor:

τοῦνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἰκάνομαι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα

υἱεῖ ἐμῷ ὠκυμῶρῳ δόμεν ἄσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν

καὶ καλὰς κνημῖδας ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας

καὶ θώρηχ'· ὃ γὰρ ἦν οἱ ἀπώλεσε πιστὸς ἑταῖρος

Τρῶσι δαμείς· ὃ δὲ κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ θυμὸν ἀχεύων.

(*Iliad* 18.457-461)

Thetis says nothing here about *time* or *kleos*. She had mentioned *time* when she first supplicated Zeus on Achilles' behalf; here again she mentions Agamemnon's theft of Briseis, the reason for Zeus' original intervention.³⁷ But now, even as she describes Agamemnon's offense, she does not mention what she originally sought from Zeus. Of course, by avenging his *hetairos*, Achilles does receive *kleos*. But now that Patroclus is dead, *kleos* is only a side effect of actions motivated by *hetaireia* – for Achilles, Thetis, and now Hephaistos as well. Insofar as Hephaistos responds to Thetis' rationale, he makes Achilles' new armor not so that Achilles may gain *kleos* or *time* but rather so that he may avenge his dead *hetairos*.³⁸

While Hephaistos accepts Achilles' desire to avenge his dead *hetairos*, Zeus worries that Achilles' anger for the death of his *hetairos* may endanger the order of the universe. As Book 20 begins, Zeus is sufficiently worried about the force of Achilles' *aristeia* that he permits the Olympians to return to battle. The reason he gives for lifting the ban on direct divine involvement is specifically Achilles' *thumos* and *kholos* for his *hetairos*:

εἰ γὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς οἶος ἐπὶ Τρῳέεσσι μαχεῖται

³⁷ Three mentions of *time* during Thetis' original supplication: τίμησόν (*Iliad* 1.505); ἡτίμησεν (507); τιμῇ (510).

³⁸ Burkert 1955, 75-80 (cited by Crotty 1994, 66n22) observes that Homeric gods pity mortals only when the suffering of the mortal touches the god personally.

οὐδὲ μίνυνθ' ἔξουσιν ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα.

καὶ δέ τί μιν καὶ πρόσθεν ὑποτρομέεσκον ὀρώντες·

νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ θυμὸν ἑταίρου χόεται αἰνῶς

δεῖδω μὴ καὶ τεῖχος ὑπέρμορον ἐξαλαπάξῃ.

(*Iliad* 20.26-30)

Zeus fears that Achilles' anger will destroy the wall "beyond fate" (ὑπέρμορον). Troy is not destined to fall yet, but Achilles' rage is strong enough to break through all its defenses. This terrible anger is roused by feelings for his *hetairos* (θυμὸν ἑταίρου χόεται αἰνῶς). The situation Zeus fears is the product of the force of *hetaireia* and the strength of Achilles, a vengeful anger that risks violating the basic apportionment of things.³⁹

2.3 Actions of *hetairoi* III: lamentation

The bond signified by *heta(i)r-* demands not only vengeance for a dead *hetairos* but also lament.⁴⁰ Warriors lament dead *hetairoi*, or *hetairoi* lament dead companions, in thirty passages.⁴¹ Five times warriors fight on "though grieved for the *hetairos*" (ἀχνύμενός περ[...])

³⁹ This is the only appearance of ὑπέρμορον in the *Iliad*. The normal Iliadic expression for 'in contradiction to the destiny of things' is ὑπὲρ αἴζαν (*Iliad* 3.59; 6.333, 487; 16.780; 17.321). For possible mythic resonances see Slatkin 1991.

⁴⁰ For a book-length treatment of lament in the *Iliad* see Tsagalis 2004. For insightful readings of each lament in *Iliad* 24 as commenting on and problematizing (but not rejecting) heroic ideology, with particular focus on the perspectives of wife and mother, see Perkell 2008. See Nagy 1979, chapter 6 for links between heroism, grief, lamentation, and the *laos* (with *hetairoi* mentioned in passing). For parallelism between Achilles' and Briseis' laments (in the tradition of geometrical interpretation of Homeric structure developed in Whitman 1958) see Lohmann 1970 and Pucci 1993 (which also traces the emotional and rhetorical sequence of lament in the *Iliad*: tension, relief, grief, relaxation).

⁴¹ *Iliad* 4.154; 9.56; 9.210; 17.459; 18.80; 18.98-99; 18.102; 18.128-129; 18.233-234; 18.235-236; 18.317; 18.343; 19.315; 19.345; 20.29; 22.390; 23.5; 23.6; 23.18; 23.37; 23.134; 23.137; 23.152; 23.178; 23.224; 23.252; 24.3-4;

ἑταίρου).⁴² The most lamented *hetairos* is of course Patroclus, but the deaths of other *hetairoi* earn lament as well.

Achilles articulates the link between lament and *hetaireia* most clearly:⁴³

ἀλλ' ὃ γε οἷς ἐτάροισι φιλοπτολέμοισι μετηύδα·

Μυρμιδόνες ταχύπωλοι ἔμοι ἐρήηρες ἐταῖροι

μὴ δὴ πω ὑπ' ὄχεσφι λυώμεθα μώνυχας ἵππους,

ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασιν ἄσσον ἰόντες

Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν· ὃ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.

(*Iliad* 23.5-9)

The scene is the first gathering of the Myrmidons after Hector's death. Vengeance achieved, Achilles' rage is relaxed enough to permit lament.⁴⁴ The passage links both violence and sorrow: Achilles speaks to his "war-loving *hetairoi*" (ἐτάροισι φιλοπτολέμοισι) as he recommends lament (Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν). Two kinds of *hetaireia* appear: Achilles' bond with Patroclus, on the one hand, and his bond with the entire Myrmidon contingent, on the other. Achilles appeals to the *hetaireia* shared by the entire group by using a first-person plural verb to recommend

24.51; 24.591; 24.792-794. Note that, apart from Achilles' laments in Book 18, acts of revenge for dead *hetairoi* cluster around Patroclus' death more thickly than acts of lament.

⁴² This sentiment is formulaic not only in the *Iliad* (8.125, 317; 13.419; 15.651; 17.459) but also in the *Odyssey*, although the Odyssean formulae focus more on death than on grief (φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἑταίρους: *Odyssey* 9.63, 566; 10.134; ὀλέσας ἀπο πάντας ἑταίρους: 9.534, 11.114, 13.340).

⁴³ For Achilles' laments in the *Iliad* see Tsagalis 2004, 143-151.

⁴⁴ Until this moment, Achilles' heart has been filled with destructive rage rather than lament since Book 19 (τό μοι οὐ τι μετὰ φρεσὶ ταῦτα μέμηλεν, / ἀλλὰ φόνος τε καὶ αἶμα καὶ ἀργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν: *Iliad* 19.213-214).

lament for Patroclus, on the one hand, and by addressing the Myrmidons as “my *hetairoi*,” on the other (ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι). The direct address to *hetairoi* is doubly marked. On the one hand, only Achilles and Patroclus use the vocative of ἐταῖροι in the *Iliad*.⁴⁵ On the other, variations on the phrase ‘my *hetairoi*’ appear only three times.⁴⁶ Here as at *Iliad* 22.272, Achilles calls his *hetairoi* “my” to express his solidarity with them – first in inescapable revenge, second in shared sorrow. Here the double appearance of *hetairoi*, first in the narrative (οἷς ἐτάροισι) and then in Achilles’ address in the following line, emphasizes that the agents of κλαίωμεν are acting as *hetairoi*. But here Achilles’ *hetairoi* are both those who are lamented and those who lament. The *geras* of the dead is not merely that other warriors, but more specifically that ‘we’, in a first-person exhortation addressed to *hetairoi*, should weep.⁴⁷

As protective *hetairoi* need not habitually be attached to the heroes they protect, and dead *hetairoi* need not habitually be associated with the heroes who avenge them, so also lamenting *hetairoi* need not habitually be associated with the hero they lament.⁴⁸ When Pandaros shoots Menelaus, Agamemnon and anonymous *hetairoi* think Menelaus’ wound is mortal and lament:

τοῖς δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων μετέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

⁴⁵ Patroclus: *Iliad* 16.270. Achilles: 23.4 (discussed in Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons”).

⁴⁶ Agamemnon: *Iliad* 1.183 (contrasting his *hetairoi* with Achilles’). Achilles: 22.272 (threatening Hector for killing his *hetairoi*) and 23.6.

⁴⁷ Achilles has just prevented the Myrmidons from scattering to their ships, as the rest of the Achaeans had already done (οἱ μὲν ἄρ’ ἐσκίδναντο ἐὴν ἐπὶ νῆα ἕκαστος, / Μυρμιδόνας δ’ οὐκ εἶα ἀποσκίδνασθαι Ἀχιλλεύς: *Iliad* 23.3-4). By subtly depicting a return that did not happen, the narrative emphasizes the Myrmidons’ sorrow by painting the *hetairoi* as immediately and uniquely arrested in their tracks by Achilles’ call for lament. For the strong cohesion and fellow-feeling in this scene see Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

⁴⁸ Odysseus asking unknown *hetairoi* for protection: *Iliad* 11.461-464. Meges avenging his otherwise unknown *hetairos* Otus: 15.518.521. Both passages are discussed above.

χειρὸς ἔχων Μενέλαον, ἐπεστενάχοντο δ' ἑταῖροι·

(*Iliad* 4.153-154)

Brother and *hetairoi* react with the same verb (στενάχων / ἐπεστενάχοντο): *hetairoi* respond exactly as brothers do. The *hetairoi* are not named; it does not matter who they are or whose *hetairoi* they are. They are called *hetairoi* because they groan for Menelaus' apparent death.

Trojan family and *hetairoi* as well join in lament for a departed hero. As Agamemnon and a group of unnamed *hetairoi* groan for Menelaus' injury, so Hector's unnamed brothers and *hetairoi* lament his death:

...αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα

ὄστέα λευκὰ λέγοντο κασίγνητοί θ' ἑταροί τε

μυρόμενοι, θαλερὸν δὲ κατεΐβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν.

(*Iliad* 24.792-794)

Here the likeness between brothers and *hetairoi* is particularly pathetic: they lay his bones to rest and weep (μυρόμενοι) together. The paired τε..τε joins brothers and *hetairoi* very closely, as a single unit. Elsewhere the link between Hector and his *hetairoi* is unusually weak, but here in their final appearance Hector's *hetairoi* lament equally with his family.⁴⁹

The Homeric formula ἀχνύμενός/οί περ[...] ἑταίρου, used only in combat scenes, expresses a complex mixture of anger and grief for a dead *hetairos*, on the one hand, and fear for

⁴⁹ For Hector's greater concern for his family, as opposed to his lesser concern for his *hetairoi*, see Chapter 2, under "Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans."

one's own safety, on the other.⁵⁰ When warriors grieve for injured *hetairoi* but fail to protect them, the reason is usually fear. This is sometimes explicit, as when the *hetairoi* of Periphetes fall back simply because they are afraid of godlike Hector:

στήθει δ' ἐν δόρυ πῆξε, φίλων δέ μιν ἐγγὺς ἐταίρων

κτεῖν'· οἳ δ' οὐκ ἐδύναντο καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐταίρου

χραιομεῖν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ μάλα δαΐδισαν Ἴκτορα δῖον.

(*Iliad* 15.650-652)

The adversative οἳ δ' οὐκ and explanatory γάρ imply that grief for their *hetairos* (ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐταίρου) would have driven them to fight if Hector had not elicited such tremendous fear (μάλα δαΐδισαν). On a literary level, this choice heightens the impression of Hector's power, insofar as it overcomes even so strong a motive as desire to retrieve the corpses of dead *hetairoi*.⁵¹

Grief deriving from *hetaireia* reveals the character of the bereaved as well as the departed. Achilles, whose bond with Patroclus uniquely allows each to be called *hetairos* to the other, expands the usual lament for a dead *hetairos* into self-blaming regret for having failed to protect the *hetairos* in the first place. In Book 18, during his first lament for Patroclus, Achilles wants to die explicitly because he did not protect his *hetairos*:

αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἐταίρω

⁵⁰ *Iliad* 8.125 (Hector abandons the corpse of his charioteer-*hetairos* Eniopes), 317 (Hector abandons the corpse of his charioteer-*hetairos* Archeptolemos); 13.419 (Antilokhos protects his *hetairos* Hypsenor, allowing two other *hetairoi* to carry him to safety); 15.651 (Periphetes' *hetairoi* fail to help him because they are afraid of Hector); 17.459 (Automedon fights for Patroclus' corpse).

⁵¹ For a parallel example see discussion of Patroclus' *aristeia* above, under "Literary use of the expectation that *hetairoi* will protect a wounded warrior."

κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμῦναι...⁵²

(*Iliad* 18.98-99)

Achilles' choice of words expresses the specific character of his regret. Here Achilles might logically blame himself for permitting Patroclus to enter combat. But the verb ἐπαμῦναι suggests active defense in battle. Its negation therefore encodes the imagined intervention of Achilles' battlefield strength under erasure. Achilles wishes to die not only because Patroclus is dead, and not only because Achilles occasioned Patroclus' death, but also because Achilles did not act as Patroclus' warrior-companion by defending (ἐπαμῦναι) him in battle.⁵³

3. The *pathos* of *hetaireia*

The semantics of *heta(i)r-* and the actions of *hetairoi* contribute vitally to the *pathos* of Iliadic battle. Two of the three most pathetic deaths of major heroes (Sarpedon, Patroclus) are suffused with *heta(i)r-* words and the general theme of warrior-companionship.⁵⁴ The third (Hector) minimizes the *pathos* associated with lamenting *hetairoi* and maximizes the *pathos* evoked by wife and parents because Hector is closer to his family than to his fellow warriors.⁵⁵

3.1 The *pathos* of *hetaireia* I: Sarpedon's death

⁵² Scholion 1 calls this passage 'καλὸν πρὸς φιλεταιρίαν παράδειγμα' – cf. also scholion 3 on *Iliad* 22.390, which in similar terms admires the Homeric portrayal of Achilles' relationship with Patroclus ('κάλλιστον οὖν πρὸς φιλεταιρίαν').

⁵³ See Zanker 1994, 99-113 for discussion of the centrality of grief to all of Achilles' emotional responses to Patroclus' death (including any wish for *kleos*).

⁵⁴ See Garland 1981 for the sixty different ways Homer narrates death; Zanker 1994, 48n1 for the *Iliad* as a poem of death rather than war.

⁵⁵ For the tension between Hector's obligations to his family and his obligations to his *hetairoi* see discussion in Chapter 2, under "Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans."

Sarpedon is especially attached to his *hetairoi*, both Lykians in general and Glaucus in particular. The causal link between his attempt to protect his *hetairoi* and his death at Patroclus' hands has already been discussed above.⁵⁶ The climax of his death-scene is his final speech to Glaucus, which is introduced by the deeply pathetic phrase "he named his dear *hetairos*" (φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον: 16.491).⁵⁷ The events leading up to Sarpedon's death, the narrative immediately surrounding his death-scene, and the contents of the death-speech itself highlight the bond between Sarpedon and his *hetairoi*.⁵⁸

Sarpedon's death is preceded by separation from his warrior-companions. In Book 16, Sarpedon is almost alone: he has no *hetairoi* but Glaucus – because Patroclus has just killed the rest of Sarpedon's *hetairoi* (*Iliad* 16.394-420). This leads Sarpedon to attack Patroclus himself. Homer emphasizes Sarpedon's isolation: Patroclus kills Sarpedon's *therapon* Thrasumelos (16.463) just before he kills Sarpedon. Because *therapon* expresses a less intimate bond than *hetairos*, this is not the affective climax of this scene, nor does it elicit Sarpedon's strongest affective response (which is reserved instead for his dying *hetairoi*).

The narrative reserves Sarpedon's last *hetairos* for his last words. Immediately after a simile comparing Sarpedon to wounded bull in a lion's jaws (482-489), as Sarpedon begins his death-speech, he names Glaucus, his dear *hetairos*:

⁵⁶ *Iliad* 16.415.422 is treated under "Actions of *hetairoi* I: protection."

⁵⁷ The phrase 'φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον' appears four times in Homer, each at a particularly pathetic moment. In Book 10, the Trojan camp awakes to Hippokoon crying aloud and naming his dear *hetairos* (*Iliad* 10.522). After Patroclus dies and Achilles avenges him, Achilles twice 'names his dear *hetairos*' (23.178; 24.591). Patroclus cannot hear Achilles as Glaucus hears Sarpedon, of course, but Patroclus' shade does speak with Achilles after death.

⁵⁸ The inseparability of the two throughout the poem is nicely described by Bowra 1930, 209: "their role in the story is one of friendship and mutual confidence."

ᾠλετό τε στενάχων ὑπὸ γαμφηλῆσι λέοντος,

ὥς ὑπὸ Πατρόκλῳ Λυκίων ἀγὸς ἀσπιστάων

κτεινόμενος μενέαινε, φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον·

Γλαῦκε πέπον...

(*Iliad* 16.489-492)⁵⁹

The narrative description of Glaucus as φίλον ἑταῖρον leads into Sarpedon's *pathos*-inducing address (Γλαῦκε πέπον). Sarpedon, son of Zeus, is the greater of the two heroes, and his rank is superior, as Homer has just noted by calling him “commander of the Lykians” (Λυκίων ἀγός). As in all other cases except Achilles and Patroclus, the hero not called *hetairos* is stronger than the hero called *hetairos* to him. But while Glaucus is physically weaker, he is no less cared for: the phrases “φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον” and “Γλαῦκε πέπον” highlight the affection Sarpedon feels for his *hetairos* even at the moment of death.

Even as he dies Sarpedon cares for the safety of his *hetairoi*. He weaves his farewell into a battlefield exhortation and offers his own corpse as a powerful motivation for his *hetairos* to lead the Lykian army:

...πολεμιστὰ μετ' ἀνδράσι νῦν σε μάλα χρή

αἰχμητήν τ' ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέον πολεμιστήν·

⁵⁹ For analyst arguments against the authenticity of this scene see Schadewaldt 1959, 155-202 (resting mainly on parallels with the death of Memnon in the *Aethiopsis*, which is better attested in painting); for rejection of these arguments on oral-poetic grounds see Nagy 1990, 130-133. For a brief survey of vase-paintings of Sarpedon's death in light of *Iliad* 16 see Saraçoğlu 2005.

νῦν τοι ἐελδέσθω πόλεμος κακός, εἰ θεός ἐσσι.

πρῶτα μὲν ὄτρυνον Λυκίων ἡγήτορας ἄνδρας

πάντη ἐποιχόμενος Σαρπηδόνοσ ἀμφιμάχεσθαι

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμεῦ πέρι μάρναο χαλκῷ.

σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος⁶⁰

ἔσσομαι ἥματα πάντα διαμπερές, εἴ κέ μ' Ἀχαιοὶ

τεύχεα συλήσωσι νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι πεσόντα.

ἄλλ' ἔχεο κρατερῶς, ὄτρυνε δὲ λαὸν ἅπαντα.

(*Iliad* 16.492-501)

Sarpedon encourages his dear *hetairos* in two ways. First he hands off the whole battle to Glaucus (νῦν τοι ἐελδέσθω πόλεμος κακός) – if he is swift (εἰ θεός ἐσσι). The line-ending conditional εἰ θεός ἐσσι recalls the exhortation that began Sarpedon's ill-fated counterattack, wherein he berated his Lykians for running away from Patroclus swiftly (αἰδῶς ᾧ Λύκιοι· πόσε φεύγετε; νῦν θεοὶ ἔστε: *Iliad* 16.422) and sets Glaucus thematically against swift-footed Achilles. Then Sarpedon hands Glaucus command of the Lykians, telling him to exhort their leaders (ὄτρυνον Λυκίων ἡγήτορας ἄνδρας) to fight around Sarpedon's body (Σαρπηδόνοσ ἀμφιμάχεσθαι) – a verb whose prefix ἀμφι often goes with *hetairoi*.⁶¹ But he especially wants

⁶⁰ The phrase κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος appears in only one other passage: at *Iliad* 17.553-559, Athena rebukes Menelaus for failing to protect Patroclus' corpse.

⁶¹ The use of 'Sarpedon' for 'Sarpedon's body' (normal in Homer) also heightens the *pathos*: even after Sarpedon dies, his *hetairoi* will fight around him.

Glaucus himself to fight around him (καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμεῦ περὶ μάρναο χαλκῷ). Heroes always exhort troops, but Sarpedon's second request flows specifically from the intimacy between Sarpedon and his *hetairos*. Sarpedon also presents the responsibility in terms of Glaucus' own life. If the Achaeans do strip Sarpedon's corpse, then Sarpedon himself (ἐγώ) will be a "blame and reproach" to Glaucus for the rest of his life (σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφεΐη καὶ ὄνειδος / ἔσσομαι ἥματα πάντα διαμπερές: 498-499). Sarpedon's last words recap his two exhortations. He tells Glaucus simply: "be strong" (ἀλλ' ἔχεο κρατερῶς), as he had said at greater length before, and "command the army" (ὄτρυνε δὲ λαὸν ἅπαντα), as he has just explained in more detail.

This scene narratively inverts and affectively builds on a scene in Book 5 where Sarpedon almost died; but his *hetairoi* saved him from death. They removed him from battle after Tlepolemos' spear-throw had wounded him in the thigh (*Iliad* 5.663-664). They propped him on an oak tree (5.692-693) to allow his dear *hetairos* Pelagon to remove the spear (5.694-695). In Book 5, Sarpedon receives support from both plural *hetairoi* and an individual *hetairos*; and the *hetairoi* keep him alive.⁶² In Book 16, the plural *hetairoi* are dead and Sarpedon receives support only from an individual *hetairos*; but this *hetairos* cannot keep him alive.

Sarpedon's final speech is successful.⁶³ Glaucus does exactly as Sarpedon asks. When the Achaean assault seems overwhelming and Sarpedon's body is in danger of being lost, Glaucus prays to Apollo for strength:

...δὸς δὲ κράτος, ὄφρ' ἐτάροισι

⁶² For this scene as foreshadowing of Sarpedon's death in book 16 see Leinieks 1973 and Neal 2006, 122-125.

⁶³ Nagy 1990, 131-140 argues that Sarpedon's death-scene implicitly prefigures his immortalization in cult, but his argument (based partly on the etymology of *ταρχύω* at 16.456 and partly on the link between Sarpedon's name and the actions of Sleep and Death) is not widely accepted.

κεκλόμενος Λυκίοισιν ἐποτρύνω πολεμίζειν,

αὐτός τ' ἀμφὶ νέκυι κατατεθνηῶτι μάχωμαι.

(*Iliad* 16.524-526)

Glaucus' exhortation echoes Sarpedon's last request: "ἀμφὶ νέκυι κατατεθνηῶτι μάχωμαι" responds to "Σαρπηδόνοσ ἀμφιμάχεσθαι" and "αὐτός τ' ἀμφὶ νέκυι" responds to "αὐτὸς ἐμεῦ περὶ μάρναο χαλκῷ." But this time the tmesis of ἀμφί highlights the proximity of the *hetairos* to the corpse (νέκυι vs. Σαρπηδόνοσ). The speech is effective, and the Lykian *hetairoi* respond. The narrative then re-echoes Sarpedon's last request (495-497), this time almost verbatim (πρῶτα μὲν ὄτρυνεν Λυκίων ἡγήτορας ἄνδρας / πάντη ἐποιχόμενος Σαρπηδόνοσ ἀμφιμάχεσθαι: *Iliad* 16.532-533).

Because Patroclus is invincible, however, the Lykians alone are too weak to protect Sarpedon's corpse. Hector too must intervene, and his intervention derives strength from Sarpedon's death (νεμεσσήθητε δὲ θυμῷ: *Iliad* 16.544). The result is the fight that matches Hector against Patroclus and finally ends Patroclus' *aristeia*. Thus the last words of a dying warrior to his dear *hetairos* kick off a chain of *hetaireia*-fueled killings that closes only at the end of the *Iliad*. Sarpedon's *hetairos* Glaucus marshals Lykian *hetairoi* to protect his dead friend's corpse; and the resulting battle leads to the killing of the greatest of all Iliadic *hetairoi*, which leads to Achilles' return.

3.2 The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: Patroclus and the death of the *pistos hetairos*

The episode leading to Patroclus' death adds a significant new semantic layer to *heta(i)r-*. At *Iliad* 15.331, Homer introduces the phrase *pistos hetairos* just after Zeus sets in motion the

events that will lead to Patroclus' death.⁶⁴ The use of this phrase begins and ends during the episode that centers on Patroclus' *aristeia* and death. Every beleaguered *pistos hetairos* but one dies in the battle leading to Patroclus' death.⁶⁵ No *pistos hetairos* appears before the machinery of Patroclus' death begins to move. Only three of the instances of *pistos hetairos* refer to Patroclus himself.⁶⁶

Every slaughtered warrior called *pistos hetairos* is killed, or spoken of as killed, in the same passage in which he is called *pistos hetairos*.⁶⁷ In every case but one, the killer of the *pistos hetairos* is Hector.⁶⁸ Thus Hector is not merely the killer of men, but also the preeminent killer of the *pistos hetairos*, especially at the part of the poem surrounding Patroclus' death. The build-up to Patroclus' death is semantic rather than merely thematic, prefiguring at the lexical level, charging the meaning of the words '*pistos*', '*hetairos*', and 'Hector' with their meaning in the greater Iliadic plot even before the crucial events occur. The Hector-*hetairos* relation first

⁶⁴ For *pistos hetairos* as 'loyal comrade' see especially Roisman 1983, who argues that death is the greatest test of loyalty. For discussion of *pistis* among warriors see Jeanmaire 1939, 101-103. Donlan 1985 correctly assumes that the Homeric *hetairos* deserves trust without question (as opposed to the Megarian *hetairoi* in Theognis), but does not recognize the semantic reason for this (i.e. that a warrior is not named *hetairos* except where he is acting and felt as *hetairos*). Ulf 1990, 136 correctly observes that *pistos* indicates a particularly tight bond (although Stichius at *Iliad* 15.331 is perhaps an exception), but does not recognize the association with death. Hummel 1988 notes that *philos* and *pistos* are metrically complementary, but minimizes the semantic difference. Konstan 1997, 33 constructs a 'terminological complex' of *hetairos*, *pistos*, and *philos*, but is more interested in locating a modern notion of friendship in Homer than in unpacking the specifically Homeric meaning of *heta(i)r-*. For the meaning of *pistos* as something 'binding and fixed' and essentially cooperative (as in *pista horkia*) see Scott 1981. For the etymological family of *peith-* see Benveniste 1973, book 1, chapter 8, section II.

⁶⁵ Alcimedon is named *pistos hetairos* to Automedon at 17.500 and neither is killed.

⁶⁶ *Iliad* 17.553-558; 18.233-240, 457-461 (all after Patroclus is dead).

⁶⁷ *Iliad* 15.329-332; 15.436-441; 17.498-506; 17.553-558; 17.587-592; 18.233-240; 18.457-461. Edwards 1984 identifies a similar semantic binding: warriors called *aristos* usually die in the passages in which they are called *aristos* (although the juxtaposition is far less consistent than that of *pistos hetairos* and death).

⁶⁸ The only exception is the Trojan Podes, whom Apollo describes as *pistos hetairos* to Hector (*Iliad* 17.589). Apollo's speech is a straightforward rebuke of Hector for failing to defend or avenge Podes. Even in the one case in which he does not himself kill the *pistos hetairos*, Hector is implicated in that man's death. For discussion of this rebuke Chapter 2, under "Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans."

sketched in Book 15 already paints Hector as he will appear to Achilles' eyes – as the killer of the *pistos hetairos*.

Because Homer constructs the link between death and the *pistos hetairos* carefully, each appearance of the *pistos hetairos* must be treated in narrative order. The first *pistos hetairos* is Stichius, a commander not named *hetairos* elsewhere:

Ἔκτωρ μὲν Στιχίον τε καὶ Ἀρκεσίλαον ἔπεφνε,

τὸν μὲν Βοιωτῶν ἡγήτορα χαλκοχιτώνων,

τὸν δὲ Μενεσθέως μεγαθύμου **πιστὸν ἑταῖρον**.

(*Iliad* 15.329-331)

The order in which Stichius and Arkesilaos are named, along with the μὲν... δέ in the following lines, seems to suggest that Skikhios is the Boeotian commander and Arkesilaos is the *pistos hetairos* of Menestheus. But Arkesilaos is named a Boeotian commander in the Catalogue of Ships, suggesting that Arkesilaos is the commander in the μὲν clause, and Stichius and Menestheus are together called *arkhoi* in book 13, suggesting that Stichius is the *pistos hetairos* mentioned in the δέ clause.⁶⁹ As usual, the warrior is named *hetairos* when it makes affective sense to do so. The change from *arkhos* to *hetairos* heightens the *pathos* of Stichius' death. This *pathos* is again increased by adding *pistos*, which here modifies *hetairos* for the first time in the *Iliad*.

⁶⁹ Arkesilaos: Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον / Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε (*Iliad* 2.495). Stichius and Menestheus: Ἀμφίμαχον μὲν ἄρα Στιχίος δῖός τε Μενεσθεὺς / ἄρχοι Ἀθηναίων κόμισαν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν (13.195-196).

Stichius and Arkesilaos are both minor heroes. Their deaths come quickly. But the next appearance of *pistos hetairos*, a hundred lines later, advances the semantic build-up to Patroclus' death by both linking the trusty *hetairos* with two major heroes and by introducing the theme of revenge.

The death of this *pistos hetairos* incites the heroes Ajax and Teucer to try to kill Hector in revenge. The victim is Lycophron, *pistos hetairos* to Ajax and Teucer and, as Ajax says, honored like family:

Τεῦκρε πέπον δὴ νῶϊν ἀπέκτατο **πιστὸς ἐταῖρος**

Μαστορίδης, ὃν νῶϊ Κυθηρόθεν ἔνδον ἐόντα

ἴσα φίλοισι τοκεῦσιν ἐτίομεν ἐν μεγάροισι·

τὸν δ' Ἔκτωρ μέγαθυμος ἀπέκτανε. ποῦ νύ τοι ἰοὶ

ὠκύμοροι καὶ τόξον ὃ τοι πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων;

(*Iliad* 15.437-441)

As the general Iliadic semantics of *heta(i)r-* require, the word *hetairos* indicates the felt relation. Lycophron was called *therapon* – the institutional relation – in the narrative voice six lines earlier (Αἴαντος θεράποντα: 431). But here Ajax calls him *pistos hetairos* as he demands revenge. This trusty companion matters quite a lot to the brothers: Ajax and Teucer esteem Lycophron as much as they esteem their own parents (**ἴσα φίλοισι τοκεῦσιν ἐτίομεν**). Ajax need not explicitly call for revenge. He need merely tell Teucer to locate his arrows (ποῦ νύ τοι ἰοὶ / ὠκύμοροι καὶ τόξον ὃ τοι πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων), and of course Teucer will kill Lycophron's killer. Again the poetry seems carefully designed to associate *pistos hetairos* specifically with

death and to paint Hector as a man who deserves to suffer vengeance for killing a trusty *hetairos*.⁷⁰

The third *pistos hetairos*, Alcimedon, is the only *hetairos* who does not die in the passage in which he is called *pistos*. The scene again pits Achaean *hetaireia* against Hector, and the way he retreats from the Myrmidon companions foreshadows his death at Achilles' hands.

During the fight for Patroclus' corpse, Alcimedon the *hetairos* sees his fellow Myrmidon Automedon (ὄψε δὲ δὴ μιν ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / Ἀλκιμέδων: *Iliad* 17.466-467) alone in his chariot, unable to fight and drive at once. Alcimedon takes the reins, allowing Automedon to leap off and prepare for combat (483). At Hector's command, Aeneas and two minor heroes, Chromius and Aretus, join Hector's attack on the two Myrmidon warriors. Automedon prays for divine aid, then immediately gives his *pistos hetairos* a specific tactical instruction:

αὐτίς ἀπ' Αὐτομέδοντος. ὃ δ' εὐξάμενος Διὶ πατρὶ

ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένεος πλῆτο φρένας ἀμφὶ μελαίνας·

αὐτίκα δ' Ἀλκιμέδοντα προσηύδα **πιστὸν ἑταῖρον**·

Ἀλκίμεδον μὴ δὴ μοι ἀπόπροθεν ἰσχύμεν ἵππους,

ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἐμπνείοντε μεταφρένω· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε

Ἔκτορα Πριαμίδην μένεος σχήσεσθαι οἶω...

⁷⁰ Ajax and Teucer respond with such force (*Iliad* 15.458-462) that Teucer's arrows would actually have ended the war (κεν ἔπαυσε μάχης ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν) if Zeus had not intervened on Hector's behalf (ἐφύλασσε / Ἔκτορ). The attempted vengeance for Lykophron has a causal as well as counterfactual role in Hector's death. Teucer's failure to avenge his *pistos hetairos* leads to Hector's final assault of Book 15 – the massive attack that finally drives Patroclus to Achilles' tent. Zeus blocks retribution for one dead *pistos hetairos* in order to kill another.

(Iliad 17.498-503)

The *pistos hetairos* in the chariot must stay so close to the Myrmidon on foot that the horses will breathe on his back (ἐμπνεΐοντε μεταφρένῳ). The maneuver seems difficult, and the tactical situation is already desperate enough: the Myrmidons are two against four, and two of the four enemies are Hector and Aeneas. The use of the phrase *pistos hetairos* bodes still further ill: twice before, both times against Hector, calling someone *pistos hetairos* was enough to seal his fate. But just after the opening salvo, in which Automedon kills Aretus and Hector's spear misses the mark, but before hand-to-hand combat can begin, the two Ajaxes enter the fray at the call of their *hetairos* (ἐταίρου κικλήσκοντος: 17.532) and Hector is forced to retreat. Achaean *hetaireia* can overcome Hector after all. This, the only scene in which the *pistos hetairos* survives, closes with an ominous foreshadowing of Achilles' revenge: as Automedon strips Aretus, the hero who died instead of Hector, he declares that killing even this lesser enemy has taken away just a bit of his sorrow for Patroclus' death (ἦ δὴ μὲν ὀλίγον γε Μενoitιάδαο θανόντος / κῆρ ἄχεος μεθέηκα χερείονά περ καταπέφνων: 538-539).

The full picture of Hector's relation to the *pistos hetairos* is now complete. Hector usually kills the *pistos hetairos*, but other warriors will risk their lives to defend their dead comrade from him. The stage is set for Patroclus himself, *hetairos par excellence*, to be named *pistos hetairos* by Athena, as she incites Menelaus to defend Patroclus' corpse:

πρῶτον δ' Ἀτρέος υἱὸν ἐποτρύνουσα προσήυδα

ἴφθιμον Μενέλαον· ὃ γάρ ῥα οἱ ἐγγύθεν ἦεν·

εἰσαμένη Φοῖνικι δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν·

σοὶ μὲν δὴ Μενέλαε **κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος**

ἔσσεται εἴ κ' Ἀχιλλῆος ἀγαυοῦ **πιστὸν ἑταῖρον**

τείχει ὕπο Τρώων ταχέες κύνες ἐλκήσουσιν.

ἀλλ' ἔχεο κρατερῶς, ὅτρυνε δὲ λαὸν ἅπαντα.

(*Iliad* 17.553-559)

Athena's command is authoritative and aggressive: she speaks in the persona of revered old Phoenix and tells Menelaus to rouse the whole army (λαὸν ἅπαντα).⁷¹ The danger posed by failure to protect the *pistos hetairos* is significant (κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος). In the *Iliad*, ὄνειδ- is extremely undesirable but fairly common.⁷² But the phrase κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος appears in only one other passage, discussed above: when a dying Sarpedon enjoins Glaucus to protect his corpse. Indeed, Athena's command is identical to Sarpedon's (ἀλλ' ἔχεο κρατερῶς, ὅτρυνε δὲ λαὸν ἅπαντα: 16.501=17.559). Sarpedon's speech is more affecting because Glaucus is emphatically Sarpedon's *hetairos* and Patroclus is not elsewhere *hetairos* to Menelaus. But Athena grasps the power of the appeal to *hetaireia*. She moves Menelaus to protect Achilles' *pistos hetairos* using the words another dying warrior used to rouse his own dear *hetairos*. From here on Patroclus is the only Achaean called *pistos hetairos*.

The echo of Sarpedon's command to protect his corpse in Athena's command to protect Patroclus' corpse rhetorically binds the two killings of *hetairoi*. But the first killing also indirectly causes the second. Zeus drives Patroclus toward Hector and Apollo as soon as Patroclus kills his son Sarpedon. And indeed Glaucus himself directly links the battles for the

⁷¹ In reply to Athena's command, Menelaus addresses her as 'Φοῖνιξ ἄττα γεραιὲ παλαιγενές' (*Iliad* 17.561), perhaps humorously given the gender of the divinity in disguise (Edwards 1995, 116-117).

⁷² ὄνειδ- appears 18 times in the *Iliad*; but the form ὄνειδος appears only in the phrase κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος.

two corpses: he berates Hector for backing off Patroclus' corpse after Hector had earlier failed to protect Sarpedon's body (*Iliad* 17.149-153). Thus *hetaireia* forges the affective links in a chain of vengeance that binds more warriors than Achilles and Patroclus. The chain begins with Patroclus' killing of Sarpedon, whose body Zeus rescues miraculously, and ends only with Achilles' defilement of Hector's body.⁷³

The only dead *pistos hetairos* that Hector does not kill is the Trojan Podes, Hector's own *hetairos*. But while Hector is not responsible for Podes' death, Apollo uses the now-charged phrase *pistos hetairos* to berate Hector one last time for failing to avenge him:

Ἕκτορ τίς κέ σ' ἔτ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν ταρβήσειεν;
οἶον δὴ Μενέλαον ὑπέτρεσας, ὅς τὸ πάρος γε
μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής· νῦν δ' οἴχεται οἶος ἀείρας
νεκρὸν ὑπ' ἐκ Τρώων, **σὸν δ' ἔκτανε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον**
ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι Ποδῆν υἱὸν Ἡετίωνος.

(*Iliad* 17.586-590)

Apollo echoes Glaucus by calling Hector a coward for failing to avenge his *pistos hetairos* Podes, as Glaucus had twice earlier called Hector a coward for failing to protect Sarpedon's corpse.⁷⁴ By now Hector is sensitive to the accusation. He attacks in a dark cloud of anger as

⁷³ The parallel between Glaucus and Achilles with respect to the corpse, which is raised in these passages, highlights the affective force of *hetaireia*. Achilles' defilement of Hector's corpse is particularly spectacular, as befits his might, but the feeling behind the spectacle – the desire to mangle even the dead body of the *hetairos*' killer – is expressed by Glaucus as well.

⁷⁴ *Iliad* 16.538-547 and 17.149-153 (calling Sarpedon *hetairos*). Both passages are discussed in Chapter 2, under "Rebuke for failing to protect *hetairoi* II: Glaucus regarding Sarpedon."

Zeus gives the Trojans victory. Thus the phrase ‘*pistos hetairos*,’ death, vengeance, and Hector’s unusual relationship with *hetairoi* remain bound together until the semantic knot touches the Achaean ships and Achilles returns to battle.⁷⁵

The last two appearances of *pistos hetairos* refer to Patroclus and are focalized through Achilles. Patroclus is called *pistos hetairos* when Achilles sees his corpse for the first time:

...αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ

ἄσπασίως Πάτροκλον ὑπ’ ἐκ βελέων ἐρύσαντες

κάτθεσαν ἐν λεχέεσσι· φίλοι δ’ ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι

μυρόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφι ποδώκης εἶπετ’ Ἀχιλλεύς

δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων, ἐπεὶ εἴσιδε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον

κείμενον ἐν φέρτρῳ δεδαῖγμένον ὀξεί χαλκῷ...

(*Iliad* 18.231-236)

Achilles’ sorrow is individual and incommunicable in its intensity, but also shared with the other *hetairoi* around him. Achilles’ living *hetairoi* stand around him (ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι) and weep while he looks on his dead, *pistos hetairos* lying on the bier.

The poetic force of *pistos hetairos* is fully at work here, as Achilles and the Myrmidons surround Patroclus’ corpse. But since *Iliad* 1, Homer has already used the semantic field of

⁷⁵ For Hector’s competing obligations to family and *hetairoi* see Chapter 2, under “Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans.”

peith-/pist- to express a unique feature of the *hetaireia* joining Achilles and Patroclus. In three passages, Patroclus obeys/is persuaded by (πείθομαι) his dear *hetairos*:

ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ,

ἐκ δ' ἄγαγε κλισίης Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον...

(*Iliad* 1.345-346)

ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ.

αὐτὰρ ὅ γε κρεῖον μέγα κάββαλεν ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῇ...

(*Iliad* 9.205-206)

ἄλλ' ἴθι νῦν Πάτροκλε Διὶ φίλε Νέστορ' ἔρειο

ὄν τινα τοῦτον ἄγει βεβλημένον ἐκ πολέμοιο·

...

ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ,

βῆ δὲ θέειν παρὰ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.

(*Iliad* 11.611-612, 616-617)

All three of these passages violate a general rule of *hetaireia*. Patroclus is often called Achilles' *hetairos*; but in these three passages Achilles is also Patroclus' *hetairos*. In no other case is the warrior to whom someone is *hetairos* also called *hetairos* to that person. Achilles' and Patroclus'

hetaireia is uniquely mutual, and all three proofs of its uniqueness are linked with the *peith-* root.⁷⁶

All three of these moments are also key to the plot.⁷⁷ In Book 1, Patroclus gives Briseis to Agamemnon's heralds, finalizing the break between Achilles and the army. In Book 9, Patroclus prepares food for the Achaean embassy, whose failure to persuade Achilles to return allows Hector to continue killing Achaeans (and almost to destroy the Achaean ships). In Book 11, Achilles tells Patroclus to ask Nestor whether the injured warrior Achilles sees is indeed Makhaon, and in the resulting conversation, Nestor plants the idea in Patroclus' mind that leads to his disastrous entry into battle.⁷⁸ Of course the phrase φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ means that Patroclus did what Achilles told him to do. But the translation "obey" is too strong.⁷⁹ In Book 19, Achilles "entreats" the same *hetairoi* that he hopes will obey/be persuaded by him as they used to be (λίσσομαι, εἴ τις ἔμοιγε φίλων ἐπιπείθεθ' ἑταίρων: *Iliad* 19.305): here "obey" implies a relation of subordination that λίσσομαι contradicts. The trust between Achilles and Patroclus is very strong, but when *peith-* becomes *pist-* the result is the death of the *pistos hetairos*. Achilles is responsible for Patroclus' death partly because he trusted his *hetairos* too much.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ The uniqueness of this relationship is treated in Chapter 2, under "Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons."

⁷⁷ Bowra 1930, 194-197 also sees these three moments as a natural three-stage unfolding of Achilles' personality (without emphasizing that these are the three passages in which Achilles is called Patroclus' *hetairos*).

⁷⁸ As Arieti 1983 notes, this inquiry is the beginning of the most critical episode of the Iliadic plot.

⁷⁹ Donlan 1979 leaves *peith-* words untranslated (and even requests further philological study at 68), but his analysis of the structure of Iliadic authority is consistent with the interpretation given here. Hammer 1997, following Donlan, interprets the ambiguity in English translation as a sign of the relative weakness of all Iliadic authority. For *peitho* in Greek thought, including the cult of the goddess, see Buxton 1982, 29-68. For an interesting Derridean reading of *peitho* in the *Iliad* (including the degree to which persuasion is compulsory) see Naas 1995.

⁸⁰ Achilles blames himself for Patroclus' death (*Iliad* 18.98-99). Two repetitions of a gnomic phrase directly implicate the persuasiveness (and thus the *peith/pist* concept) of *hetaireia* in Patroclus' death. At *Iliad* 11.793, Nestor explains to Patroclus that Achilles will listen to him because 'the persuasion of the *hetairos* is successful'

The final mention of *pistos hetairos* appears in the closing argument of Thetis' request to Hephaistos to forge a new set of armor for Achilles. Her speech begins with a litany of her sufferings, leading up to her sorrow at her son's inevitable death (*Iliad* 18.429-441). The end of Thetis' speech was discussed above for the persuasive force of Thetis' argument – that revenge for a dead *hetairos* is something for a god support with a new set of armor – but its *pathos* is further magnified by the repetition of the phrase '*pistos hetairos*' after three books of preparation:

τοὔνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἰκάνομαι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα

υἱεῖ ἐμῷ ὠκυμόρφῳ δόμεν ἄσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν

καὶ καλὰς κνημῖδας ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας

καὶ θώρηχ'· ὃ γὰρ ἦν οἱ ἀπώλεσε πιστὸς ἐταῖρος

Τρωσὶ δαμείς· ὃ δὲ κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ θυμὸν ἀχεύων.

(*Iliad* 18.457-461)

Thetis explains the fact that she comes in supplication by reference to the events just mentioned (τοὔνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἰκάνομαι). But she explains her specific request (αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα) for a new set of armor simply by saying that Achilles' *pistos hetairos* is dead (explanatory γάρ: ὃ γὰρ ἦν οἱ ἀπώλεσε πιστὸς ἐταῖρος). She closes her speech by painting the dead πιστὸς ἐταῖρος

(ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφασίς ἐστιν ἐταῖρου) just before he suggests that Patroclus don Achilles' armor. At *Iliad* 15.404, Patroclus repeats this phrase in order to explain to Eurypylos why he cannot tend Eurypylos' wounds any longer: he must go to Achilles and persuade him to do what Nestor suggested.

By contrast, Hector dies after having trusted his *hetairos* too little. At *Iliad* 22.107, after regretting his decision to ignore his *hetairos* Poulydamas (18.251), Hector imagines how others will blame him for his inevitable failure against Achilles: 'Hector, trusting in his own might, destroyed the army' (Ἑκτωρ ἥφι βίηφι **πιθήσας** ὤλεσε λαόν).

into a pathetic image: Achilles' *pistos hetairos* lying dead in the dust (κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ), the very image she hopes the new armor will help Achilles avenge.

4. Analysis: three attributes of *hetaireia*

The previous sections have discussed how *heta(i)r-* is used and what *hetairoi* do in the *Iliad*. Homer uses *heta(i)r-* to describe warriors who are actually or potentially helping others, and perceived or felt as helping others, in a military context. The culmination of this subjective, affective aspect of *hetaireia* is the *pathos* of Iliadic combat generated by danger to or death of a warrior's companions. Each passage examined above represents a unique instance of *hetaireia*, selected as a representative example of the full set of instances of companionship in combat. In the last section of this chapter, I build on the examples discussed in detail above and on a comprehensive tabulation of all actions of *hetairoi*, modifiers of *heta(i)r-*, motivation in combat, and leadership in combat, to paint a more general picture of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*. Some additional examples are mentioned briefly; the remainder of the evidence appears in the appendix.

Iliadic *hetaireia* has three basic features. First: in all cases but one, whenever someone is *hetairos* of another, the other is not *hetairos* of his *hetairos*.⁸¹ The only exception is the case of Achilles and Patroclus. This feature I call 'non-reciprocity' because the relationship of warrior to *hetairos* is not the same as the relationship of *hetairos* to warrior. Second: in all cases for which there is sufficient evidence, the warrior that is not called *hetairos* is physically more powerful than the warrior that is called *hetairos*. This feature I call 'asymmetry' because one term of the

⁸¹ Pace Stagakis 1966, which both confuses the singular and plural usages of *hetairos* and also illogically infers from the fact that some charioteers are called *hetairos*, that every charioteer is also *hetairos*.

dyadic *hetaireia*-relation is consistently different from the other in a way that is directly related to the relationship (since fighting power is essential to relationships in battle). Third: although warrior and *hetairos* are physically different and the warrior is not the *hetairos* of his *hetairos*, nevertheless, warriors who are not called *hetairoi* both give and receive protection, vengeance, and lament to and from warriors who are called *hetairoi* in relation to them. This feature I call ‘bidirectionality’ since the bond involves common action – albeit between different terms, in different modes – from warrior to *hetairos* and vice versa.

4.1 Bidirectionality

The most compressed illustration of the bidirectionality of *hetaireia* appears in Book 17, as *hetairoi* give and receive courage and protection to and from heroes within three lines:

ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο κίε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος.

στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων

παπταίνων Αἴαντα μέγαν Τελαμώνιον υἱόν.

τὸν δὲ μάλ’ αἶψ’ ἐνόησε μάχης ἐπ’ ἀριστερὰ πάσης

θαρσύνονθ’ ἐτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι...

(*Iliad* 17.114-117)

Menelaus turns and stands fast when he reaches the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, receiving safety from *hetairoi*; then he sees Ajax giving courage to *hetairoi* (θαρσύνονθ’ ἐτάρους). The bidirectionality illustrated in this passage can be generalized. To cite just a few examples: *hetairoi* protect Odysseus (*Iliad* 11.461-472), Ajax (11.585-595), Idomeneus (13.477), Aeneas, (13.489), Hector

(15.1-11) and receive protection from Antilokhos (13.417-420), Ajax (15.436-441), Hector (16.383; 17.128-131), Sarpedon (16.419), Teucer (16.512).⁸²

Feelings are bidirectional as well. Achilles' *hetairoi* lament with him as he laments for his dead *hetairos* (*Iliad* 19.3-6, 209-213). Hector twice fights on "though grieved for his [dead] *hetairos*" (8.125, 317) and his *hetairoi* mourn his death (24.792-794).

4.2 Non-reciprocity

Because bidirectionality is a positive feature, its presence can be demonstrated from these few examples and its pervasiveness can be illustrated by exhaustive listing. Because non-reciprocity is a negative, it can be demonstrated only by an exhaustive list of examples, which appears in the appendix. But a general sketch of the non-reciprocity of *hetaireia* can be illustrated from the case of Achilles and Patroclus, the one exception.

Patroclus is called Achilles' *hetairos* many times, and Achilles is called Patroclus' *hetairos* three times (*Iliad* 1.345; 9.205; 11.616).⁸³ In Book 9, each is named *hetairos* of the other over the course of fifteen lines:

Ὡς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ

...

Πάτροκλον δὲν ἑταῖρον· ὃ δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε θυηλάς.

(*Iliad* 9.205, 220)

⁸² Note that, in many (but not all) cases, the *hetairoi* offer protection without any request from the hero.

⁸³ These three passages are discussed above in a literary context, under "The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*."

The role this passage plays in the plot emphasizes Achilles' and Patroclus' mutual *hetaireia* by contrast with Achilles' relationship with the Achaean embassy. Achilles has just called Odysseus, Phoenix, and Ajax the "dearest of the Achaeans to me" (μοι σκυζομένω περ Ἀχαιῶν φίλτατοί ἐστων: *Iliad* 9.198). Thus Achilles lacks no affection for these men; but they are not called *hetairoi* to him. During the story of Meleager, Phoenix draws an analogy between Meleager and his *hetairoi*, on the one hand, and Achilles and the ambassadors, on the other. Achilles ought to avoid Meleager's error, says Phoenix: he ought not ignore pleas of his dearest *hetairoi* (ἑταῖροι...οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλτατοι: 585-586). But whereas Meleager's wife did eventually persuade Meleager (albeit only when the city itself catches fire), Achilles' mere *philtatoi* do not persuade him. Eventually Phoenix (585) and Ajax (630) both call themselves Achilles' *hetairoi*. But Achilles and the narrative do not.⁸⁴

4.3 Asymmetry

Intimacy and mutual trust notwithstanding, Achilles is incomparably stronger than Patroclus. This is an extreme case, but the principle applies generally. In every measurable case, the hero not named *hetairos* is physically stronger than the warrior named *hetairos*. This is true both on a gross statistical level and also from a brief consideration of the major cases.

On the gross statistical level: in twenty-two cases, the relative strength of the hero and his *hetairos* is clear. In every case, the individual named *hetairos* is physically weaker than the warrior to whom he is *hetairos*. In the remaining cases, the relative strength of warrior and

⁸⁴ As Kakridis 1949, 118-143 observes, Phoenix' rhetoric relies on the parallel between the embassy to Achilles and Meleager's *hetairoi*. The failure of the embassy may be taken either neo-analytically, as Kakridis does, in which case the breakdown is evidence for the intrusion of an earlier story that does not quite fit the present circumstances; or as evidence that the parallel Phoenix tries to establish simply does not obtain, at least in Achilles' mind.

hetairos is unclear. Achilles is the only warrior called *hetairos* who is stronger than the other warrior in the *hetaireia*-relationship; but in this case, because Patroclus is also called *hetairos* (and more frequently than Achilles), the Achilles-Patroclus relationship is best taken as a unique double instance of *hetaireia*, with relative strength, and corresponding responsibility, functioning along two dimensions (fighting power, in which Achilles is superior, and worldly wisdom, in which Patroclus is superior).

On the level of major heroes, simple enumeration of the most prominent examples will suffice. Achilles' only individual *hetairos*, besides Patroclus, is Antilokhos, although Achilles collectively addresses all the Myrmidons as *hetairoi*.⁸⁵ Hector's *hetairoi* include Poulydamas, Laodocus, Podes, Eniopes, Archeptolemus, Aeneas, and Sarpedon. Idomeneus' *hetairoi* include Ascalaphus, Aphares, Leipurus, Meriones, and Antilochus. Aeneas' *hetairoi* include Deiphobus, Paris, and Agenor. Sarpedon's *hetairoi* include Glaucus, Epicles, Atymnius, and Maris. Relative strength of hero and *hetairoi* should be obvious from these lists. Examples could be multiplied; the full list appears in the appendix, with the stronger of the two highlighted in grey.⁸⁶

5. *Hetaireia* vs. *philia*, *xenia*, and the relation between commander/shepherd and *laos*/*laoi*

The conjunction of these three analytical features (bidirectionality, non-reciprocity, asymmetry) distinguish *hetaireia* from other relationships in Homeric society.

5.1 *Hetaireia* vs. *philia*

⁸⁵ In Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis*, Memnon kills Antilokhos and then Achilles kills Memnon. Patroclus' role in the *Iliad* seems so similar to Antilokholos' role in the *Aethiopis* that neo-analysts have sometimes argued that Patroclus is modeled on Antilokhos. The evidence for vengeance (as opposed to mere sequence) in the case of Antilokhos is thin, however. For review and critique of neo-analytical arguments see Burgess 1997.

⁸⁶ Haubold 2000, 129-130 correctly recognizes that *hetairoi* are less important than the heroes they surround, but conflates physical asymmetry with narrative focus.

Hetaireia differs from *philia* in four ways.⁸⁷ The first difference concerns the relative character of the related individuals. With respect to the related individuals, *philia* is symmetric. Calling someone (or something) *philos* speaks nothing to the relative strength (or any other feature) of the *philos*. Any person (or thing) important to anyone can be called *philos*. This is not true of *hetairos*. In every case of *hetaireia* (except the relationship of Achilles and Patroclus) the warrior called *hetairos* is weaker than the warrior not called *hetairos*, as noted above.

The second difference concerns the domain in which the relationship is named. Individuals are named *philos* in any context, on and off the battlefield. Indeed, *philos* can even modify non-humans, especially in Homer. Thus *philos* seems to signify simply “is important to” in a way further specified by the nature of the *descriptum* (friend, body-part, inanimate object). Contrariwise, *hetairos* always describes individuals on the battlefield, with Patroclus as the sole exception.⁸⁸ In two cases, *heta(i)r-* modifies a personified abstract deity (Eris: *Iliad* 4.441; Phyuza: 9.2); but both are aspects of battle.

The third difference concerns the gender and nature of the referents. In the *Iliad*, *phil-* appears often in the feminine, referring to female individuals. It also appears in compounds and

⁸⁷ The literature on *philia* is too vast to recount in detail. The problem is complicated by the Homeric application of *philos* to non-humans, including both inanimate objects and body parts. The classic treatment remains Dirlmeier 1931, with corresponding etymological argument in Frisk 1960, but these treatments overemphasize the possessive sense of *phil-*. Benveniste 1973 corrects this on historical-linguistic grounds, noting that names containing *phil-* appear in Mycenaean; Hooker 1987, Robinson 1990, and Cairns 1993 concur on more literary grounds, explaining how modification of non-human individuals need not exclude affection, even something like interpersonal affection. Nagy 1979 (82-83, 102-111) tries to unite human and non-human usages by claiming that *philos* describes the same identity-relationship captured by Aristotle as ἄλλος αὐτός; but Nagy’s purpose is to support his theory of ritual identity signified by *therapon*, building on an argument offered in Sinos 1980. Konstan 1997, 39 approvingly cites an ancient saying, recorded in Aristotle, that ‘*philotes*[=*philia*] is equality’ (λέγεται γὰρ φιλότης ἰσότης; *Nicomachean Ethics* 1157b36). See also note 64 above.

⁸⁸ Even Patroclus becomes only *therapon* before the Achaean expedition. But the Myrmidons are a special case, treated separately in Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

in abstract form (*philotes*). Neither of these is true of *heta(i)r-*. The only two feminine instances of *heta(i)r-* refer to abstract deities (Phuza at 9.2 and Eris at 4.441). Nor is there any such abstract form of *heta(i)r-* as we see (as *hetaireia* or *hetairia*) in later texts.

The fourth difference concerns direct address. Many heroes name others *philoï* in the vocative, often at the opening of a speech. Contrariwise, ‘*hetairoi*’ appears in the vocative only in the mouths of Achilles and Patroclus. But the Myrmidons are an exceptionally tight-knit group and in both cases of the vocative the circumstances are extraordinary.⁸⁹

5.2 *Hetaireia* vs. *xenia*

Hetaireia differs from *xenia* in five ways.⁹⁰ The first difference concerns the operation of the relationship in warrior-society. With respect to the generalized gift/favor-exchange warrior-economy, archaic *xenia* is reciprocal. That is, the same incident makes guest and host *xenoi*.⁹¹

⁸⁹ The first (*Iliad* 16.270) is Patroclus taking up command. The second (23.6) is Achilles opening the funeral games. These two instances are discussed in Chapter 2 as part of a fuller treatment of Myrmidon exceptionality.

⁹⁰ The literature on *xenia* is also vast, but the philological problem is simpler than the problem of *philos* because *xenos* always refers to humans or gods. Gauthier 1973 remains influential; Herman 1987 is the most comprehensive treatment, but focuses mainly on the tension between *xenia* as a network of relationships between powerful individuals and the comparatively impersonal system of democratic *poleis*. For *xenia* specifically in Homer see especially Schied-Tissinier 1990 and Reece 1992. The most complete presentation of the relation between *xenia* and gift exchange is Donlan 1989, building on Donlan 1981, which in turn depends on the fundamental work of Finley 1978[1954] (*passim* but especially 98-104; cf. Qviller 1981, 112-113). Hooker 1989 tempers Finley by emphasizing the importance of non-economic affinities (including some that involve gift-giving with no apparent expectation of recompense and the unreliability of gift-exchange (such as Agamemnon’s gifts to Achilles in *Iliad* 9) in Homer. Seaford 1994 builds an interesting historical argument on these failures, presenting the inadequacies of reciprocity as central to the development of the supra-*oikos* structure of the *polis*. For an overview of the broader social context see essays in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford 1998. For critique of this ‘corporate’ picture of *xenia* (arguing that the relation has an affective component as well) see Konstan 1997, 33-37.

The double meaning of *xenos* itself is historical-linguistically irreducible, insofar as other cognates of the **ghosti* root (English *guest*, *host*; Latin *hostis*, *hospes*) retain the ambiguity. For the Indo-European vocabulary and concept of hospitality see Benveniste 1973, book 1 chapter 7.

⁹¹ Herman 1987, 41-72 speculatively reconstructs a formal supplication and initiation ritual, but the evidence is sketchy and the resulting emphasis on the externality of *xenia* (15-17), as opposed to the internality of *philia*, depends too heavily on silence.

But since in any given case of *xenia* the guest owes the host something different than the host owes the guest, the obligations of *xenia* are not the same. This situation is inverse to that of *hetaireia*, since a hero is not *hetairos* of his *hetairos* (non-reciprocity) but both a hero and his *hetairos* owe one another the same immediate support (bidirectionality).

The second difference concerns the genesis of the relationship. *Xenia* comes into being at a particular moment. The master may turn a traveler away; but once he accepts the traveler, both parties must follow the rules of *xenia*.⁹² With one possible exception, *hetaireia* does not come into being at any particular moment.⁹³ Warriors are *hetairoi* just when they act as *hetairoi*, almost always in battle.

The third difference concerns the related persons. Because *xenia* relates guest and host, it can only obtain between individuals. So tightly is the status of *xenos* bound to the individual that the relationship is inherited, as in the case of Glaucus and Diomedes.⁹⁴ Neither of these is true of

⁹² For example, in *Odyssey* 4, Menelaus' gatekeeper Etoneus does not admit Telemachus and Peisistratus at first, but instead checks with Menelaus to confirm his decision. Menelaus overrides with some vehemence (οὐ μὲν νῆπιος ἦσθα..ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε πάϊς ὥς νήπια βάζεις) by appealing to the basic concept of generalized reciprocity; but it remains that Etoneus' response was not automatic. The dismissal of this scene as "comedy" in Konstan 1997, 34 contains insight but goes a little too far.

⁹³ Idomeneus will be Agamemnon's *hetairos* as he "swore and assented" earlier (μὲν τοι ἐγὼν ἐρίηρος ἐταῖρος / ἔσσομαι, ὥς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα: *Iliad* 4.266-267). This perhaps implies one or two moments of genesis, but the Homeric narrative does not contain either of these moments. It also seems plausible that 'ὥς τὸ πρῶτον' does not imply that the content of the oath was specifically that Idomeneus should be Agamemnon's *hetairos*, but rather implies only that something Idomeneus swore and assented results in Idomeneus being Agamemnon's *hetairos* in the future. Nor is this oath mentioned elsewhere in Greek literature – unless it is the oath Idomeneus swore during the wooing of Helen; but when this oath is mentioned (first in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*; never in Homer) it has nothing to do with *hetaireia*. I discuss this important passage at greater length in Chapter 2, under "Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans."

⁹⁴ Diomedes and Glaucos are actually on the battlefield, about to fight, when they realize that they are *xenoi* and exchange gifts instead (*Iliad* 6.232-236). The guest-host relational structure probably influences this passage at a rhetorical level, as a foil: the protection and absolute trust offered and expected between *xenoi* is profoundly opposed to the fury of battle. For an important economic analysis of this scene, see Donlan 1989.

hetaireia. Individuals are often called *hetairos*, but groups are called *hetairoi* more frequently.⁹⁵ Nor is Iliadic *hetaireia* inherited.⁹⁶ Heritable *hetaireia* would be inconsistent with the *de facto* character of the relationship.

The fourth difference concerns the role of the relationship in the context of battle. In the case of Glaucus and Diomedes, *xenia* trumps animosity in battle.⁹⁷ This does not happen because *xenia* is stronger than animosity – Glaucus and Diomedes remain enemies – but because the relationship between individuals (*xenia*) is activated when the two individuals encounter one another. Contrariwise, *hetaireia* cannot possibly obtain among enemies in battle because *hetairoi* are in essence those who offer or need support in battle. This is not because *hetaireia* is stronger than animosity, but rather because no individual or group would even be called *hetairos* or *hetairoi* in either narrative or direct speech unless he or they were giving or receiving (or about to give or receive) military support.

The fifth difference is literary. In a strict sense, *xenia* is the material cause of the Trojan war: *xenia* is what the Trojan war is ‘about’. This is true both positively and negatively:

⁹⁵ For singular *hetairos* versus plural *hetairoi* see introduction to Chapter 2. The plural of *xenos* appears only four times in the *Iliad*. The first two of these must describe several individuals, each constituted *xenos* separately. The other two are inconclusive but give no indication of anything inconsistent with the standard picture of *xenia* as obtaining between individuals. At *Iliad* 6.231, the plural ξείνοι πατρώιοι refers to two individuals (Diomedes and Glaucus). At 11.779, the plural ξείνοις refers to the set of everyone for whom ξείνιά is obligatory (θέμις). At 17.584, the plural ξείνων partitively refers to every *xenos* of Hector, of whom Phainops, Apollo’s chosen disguise, is the dearest (φίλτατος). At 24.202, the plural ξείνους refers to those among whom Priam, along with his subjects, was once renowned for wisdom.

⁹⁶ Diomedes calls himself and Glaucus ‘ξείνοι πατρώιοι’ (*Iliad* 6.231). The analogous term ἑταῖρος πατρώϊός appears only in the *Odyssey* (2.254, 286; 17.69), where (a) the relevant passages do not imply that *hetaireia* is inherited and (b) *hetaireia* works quite differently in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Moreover, the difference between Iliadic and Odyssean *hetaireia* is related to the difference between kin and non-kin companions, as I discuss in Chapter 3.

⁹⁷ There is no reason to consider this episode as either anomalous or normative. But it does show that *xenia* can trump the battlefield situation, which would be unintelligible in the case of *hetaireia* (since warriors are not called *hetairoi* unless already warranted by context).

positively, insofar as *xenia* accounts for Menelaus' gracious reception of Paris; and negatively, insofar as Paris' violation of *xenia* accounts for the Achaean attack. Contrariwise, because Iliadic *hetaireia* chiefly concerns the battlefield, Iliadic *hetaireia* obtains only because Achaeans and Trojans are at war. Thus *xenia* forms a causal outer shell – it makes the war happen – while *hetaireia* constitutes the inner coherence at both in-world psychological and out-of-world plot levels. That is, *hetaireia* accounts for most warriors' in-battle decisions and eventually causes Achilles' return.⁹⁸

5.3 *Hetaireia* vs. the relationship between shepherd/commander and *laos/laoi*

Hetaireia differs from the relationship between shepherd/commander and *laos/laoi* in four ways.⁹⁹ The first difference concerns the relation between the *relata* and the existence of the relationship. With respect to the constitution of the relationship, the commander-*laos* relation is unidirectional. That is, the commander protects and leads his *laoi*, but the *laoi* have no personal tie to him. Whether or not someone is *hetairos* depends on both the *hetairos* and the warrior to whom he is *hetairos*.

⁹⁸ See the appendix for tabular summary of warrior motivation. The centrality of *hetaireia* as motivator also helps account for the momentum of the Trojan war, famously manifest in the Achaean refusal of Priam's offer to return everything Paris stole (*Iliad* 7.388-432) except Helen herself. Now that *hetairoi* are dead, they must be avenged; their deaths demand more *tisis* than Helen's stolen wealth. Cf. Mueller 1984, 67 on the importance of the disappearance of the "original cause" of the war, with discussion in Zanker 1994, 48-53.

⁹⁹ Scholarship on *laos/laoi* is comparatively thin; a full literature survey occupies only three pages in Haubold 2000, which remains the only book-length study. The positive character of the relationship itself is deduced mostly from the term 'shepherd of the people' (ποιμένα/ποιμένι λαῶν), expanded by comparison with Near Eastern concepts of the shepherd-king. Haubold agrees with the general characterization of the *laos* in van Effenterre 1977 as any group of subordinate, passive inferiors in relation to a commander/protector, and builds on Nagy 1979, chapter 5, which focuses on the poetics of *laos* by linking grief and *laos* in Achilles' name (etymologized as **Akhí-lâuos*). For political context see Donlan 1979; for *laos* as an index of political power, see Catanzaro 2008, 170-173. For *laos* as pre-Dorian see Benveniste 1973, book 3, chapter 9. For the martial (or at least potentially violent) concept encoded in the notion of 'shepherd' (given the paradigmatic vulnerability of herd animals to predators and the consequent role of the shepherd as the prey's answer to predation) cf. Goethe's memorable phrase "und wer kein Krieger ist, soll auch kein Hirte sein" (cited in Finley 1978, 97; quoting Frankel 1921, 60, quoting from *Pandora*).

The second difference is grammatical. *Laos/laoi* is a collective noun, while *hetairos* is a count noun. That is, *hetairos* can appear in singular form, in which case it refers to one person, or plural form, in which case it refers to many persons. Contrariwise, *laos/laoi* refers identically with respect to number in both singular and plural grammatical form.¹⁰⁰ In both grammatical numbers it refers to one object, namely, the group of recipients of protective leadership by the commander.¹⁰¹

The third difference concerns the role of *laoi* in battle. *Laoi* are always passive in battle.¹⁰² They do not fight unless someone commands them. Contrariwise, *hetairoi* often fight without being told to fight. In fact, uncommanded *hetairoi* regularly rescue endangered heroes, whether or not those heroes command them in other passages.¹⁰³

The fourth difference concerns reference. Only warriors are called *hetairoi*. Warriors and non-warriors alike are called *laos/laoi*.¹⁰⁴ Thus *hetaireia* is a relation among warriors only, while the shepherd/*laos* relation obtains between protector and protected with no reference to the nature or activity of the protected. Because the *Iliad* is about a siege, most – though not all – instances of *laos/laoi* refer to soldiers. But even when warriors are called *laos/laoi*, they are signified as recipients of protection, not as fighters.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ For discussion of the variation see Welskopf 1981 and Wyatt 1994-1995, cited in Haubold 2000, 1n3.

¹⁰¹ For the collective nature of the *laos* see Donlan 2002, 157.

¹⁰² Van Effenterre 1977, 51-52; Haubold 2000, 14-46.

¹⁰³ See Chapter 2 and appendix for analysis of Iliadic command.

¹⁰⁴ *Contra* Jeanmaire 1939, 57, refuted in Maddoli 1970 and Latacz 1977, 121.

¹⁰⁵ Van Effenterre, 1977, 51.

The uniqueness of *hetaireia* as a social relation can be summarized as follows. *Hetaireia* is bidirectional, non-reciprocal, and asymmetric warrior-companionship. *Philia* is bidirectional and non-reciprocal, but it is also symmetric: stronger and weaker individuals are both called *philos* of the other. *Xenia* is bidirectional and, in any given encounter, asymmetric, but it is also reciprocal: guest and host are each *xenos* of the other. The relation between shepherd/commander and *laos/laoi* is non-reciprocal and asymmetric, but not bi-directional: the people are passive to the active guidance and protection of the commander and do not offer him protection in return.

* * *

This chapter has discussed what *heta(i)r-* means, what *hetairoi* do, how Homer uses *hetaireia* for literary effect, and how *hetaireia* differs from other social relationships in the archaic period. Most examples treated above either represent the response of an individual warrior to nearby *hetairoi* in need (or vice versa) or illustrate the *pathos* generated by the death of a particular, named *hetairos* in battle. Insofar as *hetaireia* binds warriors on the battlefield, the way *hetaireia* affects individual warriors should be related to, but distinct from, the way *hetaireia* affects groups of warriors in battle. Chapter 2 complements the discussion of the meaning, activity, and nature of *hetaireia* presented in this chapter with an examination of groups of *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*, most commonly signified by the phrase ἔθνος ἑταίρων.

CHAPTER 2: GROUPS OF *HETAIROI* IN THE *ILIAD*

Introduction

The *Iliad* is sometimes said to focus on heroic excellence at the expense of the rank and file.¹ If this is true of battle description in the *Iliad*, it is certainly not true of Iliadic warrior-companionship. The plural *hetairoi* appears more often (111 times) than the singular *hetairos* (80 times), and groups of *hetairoi*, no less than individual *hetairoi*, commonly influence the course of battle. Nor are groups of *hetairoi* undifferentiable masses, for the most common term for groups of *hetairoi* is ἔθνος ἑταίρων. As I argue in this chapter, ἔθνος in Homer signifies, not a collective,² but a dynamic unity of individuals acting together.³

The three attributes of *hetaireia* discussed in Chapter 1 – bidirectionality, non-reciprocity, and asymmetry – characterize hero-*hetairoi* relations no less than hero-*hetairos* relations. The hero protects, avenges, and laments his warrior-companions (and vice versa) when the *hetairoi* are many just as when the *hetairos* is one. But when the *hetairoi* form a group, the hero also becomes a commander. As I discuss below, the degree to which the hero succeeds as a commander is proportional to the degree to which the hero follows the norms of *hetaireia* in leading his warrior-band.

¹ This is still a standard but no longer uncontroversial position; see bibliographical survey in general introduction.

² Certainly not an ethnic group: see Snodgrass 1971, 55-57, 419-421, 434-436; Welskopf 1981; Donlan 1985, 295; Hall 1997, 35; McInerney 2001; Skinner 2012, 3-59.

³ For *hetairoi* as individuals as opposed to the collective *laos/laoi* see Haubold 2000, 128-130.

The link between one-to-one and one-to-many *hetaireia* is best understood from three examples. Where one-to-one *hetaireia* is strongest, one-to-many *hetaireia* is also strongest, and leadership most effective – as in the case of Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons. Where one-to-one *hetaireia* is weakest, leadership is least effective and sometimes actively harmful. The two paradigmatic conjunctions of weak *hetaireia* and ineffective leadership are Agamemnon and Hector. The thesis of the final section of this chapter is that the weakness of these two heroes’ *hetaireia* is causally linked with unsuccessful leadership in battle.

In this chapter I discuss groups of *hetairoi* in order to understand how *hetaireia* affects battle in the *Iliad*, focusing especially on the relationship between heroes and the *hetairoi* that surround them in combat. In the first section, I examine the phrase ἔθνος ἐταίρων, the standard term for groups of *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*. Surveying all appearances of ἔθνος in Homer, and observing that ἔθνος is almost always modified by ἐταίρων, I extract a general meaning of ἔθνος as ‘dynamic aggregate’ – a group whose unity lies in the common but not lock-step movement of individual members, whose coordination derives from following those nearby (*amph-*) rather than from any overarching order. I interpret the dynamic unity of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων through the attributes of *hetaireia* identified in Chapter 1 and consider how the archaic meaning of ἔθνος is informed by the nature of *hetaireia*, observing that ἔθνος and ἐταῖρος are cognate (from PIE **swe-*).

In the second section of Chapter 2, I consider the poetic uses to which Homer puts the two formulae in which most instances of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων are embedded. The first formula (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο) describes the retreat of the beleaguered hero into the band of *hetairoi*. I discuss how Homer uses this formula to magnify the shock of Patroclus’ death: in every case except Patroclus’ retreat at *Iliad* 16.814-821, the ἔθνος ἐταίρων keeps the hero safe,

even if the hero is seriously wounded. The second formula (στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἑταίρων) describes the reversal of battle by the arrival of the ἔθνος ἑταίρων and appears only three times in the *Iliad*. In each case, I argue, the turning of the battle marks a turning in the plot, and together these three reversals lead to Patroclus' entry into battle, Hector's victory over Patroclus, and Achilles' return.

After establishing the nature and role of the ἔθνος ἑταίρων, in the third section of Chapter 2 I turn to organizational aspects of *hetaireia* in the warrior group. From a close reading of Homer's descriptions of the Achaean and Trojan armies I observe that *hetairoi* are absent from formal military structure, and I reinforce the suggestion offered in Chapter 1 that Homer uses *heta(i)r-* to describe warriors only when they are relating to others as *hetairoi*, that is, as actual or potential agents or recipients of protection, vengeance, and lament in a setting of war. To understand the non-institutional relationship between heroes and groups of *hetairoi*, I draw on a complete study of commands issued by humans to other humans in the *Iliad* (tabulated in the appendix) and conclude that heroes lead *hetairoi* by a mixture of exhortation, persuasion, and inspiration (usually signified by κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω) rather than authoritarian command and control.

In the final section of Chapter 2, I apply the findings of Chapter 1 and of the earlier sections of Chapter 2 to three key instances of one-to-many *hetaireia*, relating the nature of the ἔθνος ἑταίρων and norms of Iliadic leadership to the successes and failures of Agamemnon, Hector, Achilles, and Patroclus as leaders of men in battle. I find that Agamemnon not only does not typically respond to the needs of *hetairoi* in battle, but also describes Achilles' *hetairoi* as “your *hetairoi*” (σοῖς ἑτάροισι) in contrast to “my *hetairoi*” (ἐμοῖς ἑτάροισι) at the moment he claims Briseis (*Iliad* 1.178-187) – a distinction drawn only by Agamemnon in this passage. I also

observe that Hector repeatedly fails to protect *hetairoi* in need; is repeatedly upbraided for his failure; and ignores the good advice of his *hetairos* Poulydamas, leading to his death at Achilles' hands. I close with a contrast: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons are paragons of *hetaireia* at both individual and group levels in distinctive, linguistically marked ways.

1. ἔθνος ἑταίρων as group of *hetairoi*

Variants on the unit ἔθνος ἑταίρων occur fifteen times in Homer, all in the *Iliad*.⁴ The exact phrase ἔθνος ἑταίρων occurs six times; every appearance is emphatic and final, completing a line with a bucolic diaeresis.⁵ The word ἔθνος appears without *hetairoi* only three times.

The tight semantic link between ἔθνος and *hetairoi* is evident from the few passages in which the human ἔθνος is not explicitly composed of *hetairoi*: *Iliad* 12.330 (Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος); 13.495 (λαῶν ἔθνος); 17.552 (Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνος). In all three cases, the ἔθνος is composed of warriors described by a plural noun in the genitive case, and the warriors composing the ἔθνος are giving or receiving help in battle.

At *Iliad* 12.330, Sarpedon and Glaukos lead the large *ethnos* of Lykians (Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος ἄγοντε) immediately after Sarpedon explains that the responsibility of heroes is to fight among the *promakhoi*. Glaukos and Sarpedon are given the highest honors because they “fight among the foremost Lykians” (ἐπεὶ Λυκίοισι μέτα πρότοισι μάχονται). Thus in this context the Lykians are depicted as a fighting force spearheaded by two major heroes who deserve honor because they fight among the warrior group. The structure of the relation between Lykians and

⁴ *Iliad* 3.32; 7.115; 11.585, 595; 13.165, 533, 566, 596, 648; 14.408; 15.591; 16.817; 17.114, 581, 680. Interestingly, the ἔθνος ἑταίρων does not appear after Patroclus' corpse is returned to Achilles – presumably because Iliadic warfare from this point forward is personally dominated by Achilles.

⁵ The last three of these (*Iliad* 17.114, 581, 680) are also the last three appearances of ἔθνος ἑταίρων in all variants.

heroes in this passage is therefore the same as the structure of the relation between *hetairoi* and heroes elsewhere in the *Iliad*.

At *Iliad* 13.494-495, Aeneas' *thumos* rejoices when he sees the ἔθνος of *laoi* (ὥς Αἰνεΐα θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γεγήθει / ὥς ἴδε λαῶν ἔθνος ἐπισπόμενον ἑοῖ αὐτῷ) coming to his aid against Idomeneus and nearby *hetairoi*. Here the λαῶν ἔθνος provides both moral and physical support when it appears near the hero (ἐπισπόμενον ἑοῖ αὐτῷ). Thus the *laoi* are depicted as nearby supporters, functionally paralleling *hetairoi* elsewhere. Moreover, this λαῶν ἔθνος appears because Aeneas has just called out to his *hetairoi* at 13.489 (Αἰνεΐας δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐκέκλετο οἷς ἐτάροισι). Thus the λαῶν ἔθνος is at least partly composed of individual warriors just named *hetairoi*. Some shading toward the semantics of *heta(i)r-* is also likely insofar as *laos/laoi* usually signifies passive, subordinate, endangered individuals, quite the opposite of their role in this passage.⁶

At *Iliad* 17.552, Athena hides herself amid the ἔθνος of Achaeans and rouses each man to fight for Patroclus' corpse (δύσσετ' Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνος, ἔγειρε δὲ φῶτα ἕκαστον). Here the Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνος refers again to a group of nearby warriors giving aid (and receiving encouragement) in battle. But Athena, of course, does not need help from anyone; from her perspective, the nearby warriors are not safety-bringing *hetairoi*, but rather simply Achaeans, as they are named in this passage.

⁶ For *laos/laoi* see Chapter 1, under “*Hetaireia* vs. the relationship between shepherd/commander and *laos/laoi*.” For the passivity of the *laos/laoi* see van Effenterre 1977, 51-52.

Thus in both grammatical and narrative respects these three instances of ἔθνος+[gen-pl] are parallel to ἔθνος ἐταίρων. The meaning of ἔθνος in the *Iliad*, therefore, must be understood partly in relation to the meaning of *hetairoi*.

1.1 The semantics of ἔθνος and the dynamic unity of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων

Both ἔθνος and ἐταῖρος derive from PIE **swe-*.⁷ As with ἐταῖρος, the reflexive and merely anaphoric senses of **swe-* suggest two basic meanings of ἔθνος in the Homeric text. The anaphoric sense appears when groups named ἔθνος are composed of individuals moving with reference to nearby individuals, like a swarm. The reflexive sense appears when the ἔθνος ἐταίρων forms around one major hero, usually when the hero is in retreat.

The general meaning of ἔθνος is clear from the common application of the term to groups of warriors and groups of animals.⁸ Similes suggest that ἔθν- connotes the internally dynamic unity of a semi-coherently moving group: ἔθνεα μελισσάων (*Iliad* 2.87) describes bees swarming and ἔθνεα χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων (2.459-460) describes several types of birds flocking. Animals flock or swarm in ἔθνεα as warriors move as ἔθνος ἐταίρων.⁹ The locus of comparison is the particular kind of movement. Thus the image painted by ἔθνος ἐταίρων is that of warriors moving together but not rigidly; energized as individuals, not organized units, but coordinated naturally. Just as there is no overarching order in Iliadic *ethnea* of animals, so there is no

⁷ Chantraine 1968, s.v.; Benveniste 1973, book 3, chapter 3; Gates 1971; Beekes 2009, s.v.. For more on **swe-* see discussion in Chapter 1. For general treatments of ἔθνος in relation to other Homeric terms for groups, see Welskopf 1981.

⁸ The term ἔθνος ἐταίρων is thus not properly military. It is interesting that ἔθνος ἐταίρων, the nearest Homeric equivalent to ‘warrior-band’, does not derive from PIE **dreu-* (trust, strength, oak), whence derive many terms for warrior-bands in Germanic, Slavic, and Celtic languages. For the usual Indo-European semantics of personal loyalty among warriors see Benveniste 1973, book 1, chapter 8.

⁹ Singor 1991, 20 recognizes the density of the ἔθνος (also suggested by the animal similes) but not the internal dynamism.

overarching order in the ἔθνος ἑταίρων. The unity of the group is emergent, not constitutive; it flows from action in battle, not from any formal military structure.¹⁰

It follows that a group of warriors is called ἔθνος ἑταίρων only insofar as the group acts like an aggregate of nearby warriors acting together, just as warriors are called *hetairoi* only insofar as they act as nearby helpers in battle.¹¹ In the *Iliad*, ἔθνος does not mean ‘tribe’ but rather ‘group acting together’ in the way swarms and flocks do.¹²

The internal movement of the ἔθνος ἑταίρων is also evident in narrative apart from similes comparing the warrior-band to masses of animals in flight. The clearest example appears in Menelaus’ eyes during the fight for Patroclus’ corpse:

πάντοσε παπταίνων ὥς τ’ αἰετός, ὃν ῥά τέ φασιν

ὀξύτατον δέρκεσθαι ὑπουρανίων πετεηνῶν,

ὃν τε καὶ ὑψόθ’ ἐόντα πόδας ταχὺς οὐκ ἔλαθε πτώξ

θάμνω ὑπ’ ἀμφικόμῳ κατακείμενος, ἀλλὰ τ’ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ

ἔσσυτο, καὶ τέ μιν ὄκα λαβὼν ἐξείλετο θυμόν.

ὥς τότε σοὶ Μενέλαε διοτρεφὲς ὅσσε φαεινὸν

¹⁰ The picture offered here is thus slightly more precise than the (not inaccurate) translation “mass of companions” offered in van Wees 1988, 2.

¹¹ Van Wees 1988, 6n23 estimates that each band was composed of fifty men, but the exact number is never specified and cannot be generalized from the passage he cites (*Iliad* 8.562-563).

¹² The Homeric picture of ἔθν- is a typically accurate description of nature: see Liu and Passino 2000 for an overview of swarming, flocking, and schooling behaviors, which can typically be characterized by mathematical structures (Markov chains) that capture only the dynamic relation of one element to its neighbors. For an interesting comparison of Myrmidon battlefield behaviors with the behavior of ants (as described by modern entomologists), see Sears 2010. In the *Odyssey*, *hetairoi* simply appear in the plural without any group noun – presumably because they are on ships, not on the battlefield, and therefore have no space to move like a flock or a swarm.

πάντοσε δινείσθην πολέων κατὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων...

(*Iliad* 17.674-680)

Menelaus sees everything (ὅσσε φαεινῶ / πάντοσε), like an eagle (ὥς τ' αἰετός). His perspective is as panoptic as a Homeric simile.¹³ As in the similes comparing the movement of groups of birds and bees to the movements of groups of warriors, here Menelaus himself sees a measure of dynamic unity in the bands of many *hetairoi* (πολέων κατὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων).¹⁴

1.2 Retreat and reversal: the military function of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων

The Homeric ἔθνος ἐταίρων is not a military unit. Heroes lead *hetairoi*, but never an ἔθνος ἐταίρων. Nor does any ἔθνος ἐταίρων attack an enemy force. Rather, the military function of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων is purely defensive. In twelve out of fifteen appearances of the phrase, the ἔθνος ἐταίρων keeps a retreating hero safe.¹⁵ In most cases the hero seeks safety by retreating into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. In three cases the arrival of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων causes the hero to turn around and fight.¹⁶ All three moments of *peripateia* caused by the ἔθνος ἐταίρων are also turning-points in the plot.

¹³ For “eusynopsis” in Iliadic narrative see Purves 2010, chapter 1.

¹⁴ This is, significantly, the last appearance of ἔθνος ἐταίρων. After scanning the army, Menelaus finds Antilokhos among the bands of *hetairoi* and sends him to Achilles with news of Patroclus’ death. From here on, the uniquely reciprocal *hetaireia* between Achilles *hetairos* and Patroclus *hetairos* dominates the Iliadic depiction of *hetaireia*. Groups of warriors no longer matter as much as they did before Achilles’ return.

¹⁵ *Iliad* 7.115 (ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν ἴζευσὼν μετὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 11.595 (στῆ δὲ μεταστρεφθεῖς, ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 15.591 (στῆ δὲ μεταστρεφθεῖς, ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 17.114 (στῆ δὲ μεταστρεφθεῖς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 17.581 (ἀτὰρ Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος / νεκρὸν ὑπ’ ἐκ Τρώων ἔρυσεν μετὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 17.680 (πάντοσε δινείσθην πολέων κατὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων); 3.32 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 11.585 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 13.165 (ἄψ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο); 13.533 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο); 13.566 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 13.596 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 13.648 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 14.408 (ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἄλεεινων); 16.817 (ἄψ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο).

¹⁶ Signified by the phrase ‘στῆ δὲ μεταστρεφθεῖς, ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων’: *Iliad* 11.595; 15.591; 17.115.

1.2.1 Safety in retreat: the phrase “ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο”

The majority of usages of ἔθνος ἐταίρων (nine out of fifteen) occur in the phrase “ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο”: the beleaguered hero retreats into the group of *hetairoi*. The Homeric verb χάζομαι seems to belong specifically to the lexicon of the battlefield, insofar as χάζομαι appears frequently in the *Iliad* but never in the *Odyssey*. The line is usually (seven out of nine times) completed by “κῆρ’ ἀλεείνων” (“avoiding death”).¹⁷ In every case but one, the ἔθνος ἐταίρων successfully defends the retreating hero.¹⁸

In every case but one, the hero is either wounded or vulnerable after a failed attack before he retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων.¹⁹ Eurypolos’ retreat in book 11 is typical:

τὸν δ’ ὥς οὖν ἐνόησεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδῆς
τεύχε’ ἀπαινύμενον Ἀπισάονος, αὐτίκα τόξον
ἔλκετ’ ἐπ’ Εὐρυπύλῳ, καί μιν βάλε μηρὸν ὀϊστῷ
δεξιόν· ἐκλάσθη δὲ δόναξ, ἐβάρυνε δὲ μηρόν.

ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ’ ἀλεείνων...

(*Iliad* 11.581-585)

¹⁷ *Iliad* 3.32; 11.585; 13.566, 596, 648; 14.408; 16.817.

¹⁸ The exception is significant: at *Iliad* 16.817, Patroclus retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων but Hector penetrates the band of *hetairoi* and kills Patroclus anyway. I treat this passage in detail below.

¹⁹ Wounded: Eurypolos (11.585); Helenus (13.596); Patroclus (16.817). Vulnerable after attack: Meriones (13.165); Adamas (13.566); Harpalion (13.648); Hector (14.408). The exception is Paris at *Iliad* 3.32, who retreats in fear at the sight of Menelaus.

Paris' arrow disables Eurypolos' thigh (ἐβάρυνε δὲ μηρόν), leaving him useless for combat. He retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, escaping death (κῆρ' ἀλεείνων). But he does not disappear from battle. Rather, he inspires the nearby warriors to protect Ajax as well:

ἦϋσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον Δαναοῖσι γεγωνώς·

ὦ φίλοι Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες

στῆτ' ἐλελιχθέντες καὶ ἀμύνετε νηλεὲς ἦμαρ

Αἴανθ', ὅς βελέεσσι βιάζεται, οὐδέ ἔφημι

φεύξεσθ' ἐκ πολέμοιο δυσηχέος· ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἄντην

ἴστασθ' ἀμφ' Αἴαντα μέγαν Τελαμώνιον υἱόν.

(*Iliad* 11.586-591)

Eurypolos' rhetoric is well-founded. Desire to protect or avenge fellow warriors is by far the most common reason for which warriors fight, kill, or risk their lives in battle, appearing almost seven times more often than the next most common combat motivator.²⁰ The wounded warrior trusts the ἔθνος ἐταίρων for protection and successfully rouses his hero to protect another nearby hero, and he offers no reason but the fact that Ajax is in danger.

²⁰ Summary of combat motivation in the *Iliad* (motivator: count of instances): *hetaireia*: 123; shame (*aidos*, *elekhos*, *nemesis*, *neik-*, *oneidos*): 18; family: 14; *kleos*: 9; booty: 9; revenge: 8; *kudos*: 6; fighting itself: 5; fatherland: 4; battle-lust: 3; Helen: 3; honor: 3; protect Troy: 3; protect Troy and family: 2; glory: 2; payment: 2; capture enemies: 2; capture Troy: 1; sheer destruction: 6; *eris*: 1; *eros*: 1; *eukhos*: 1; expedition: 1; fear of commander: 2; *geras*: 1; gift (*dosis*): 1; *kharis*: 1; oath (broken): 1; oath (taken): 1; property: 1; safety: 1; ships: 1; survival: 1; *thumos* and Zeus: 1; *thumos* or god: 1. The appendix includes references, evidence, and further breakdown, and represents a comprehensive study of the 'combat drives' discussed suggestively but incompletely in van Wees 1996.

Eurypolos' choice of words is also significant. When the warriors receive his retreat, they are called ἔθνος ἐταίρων. But when Eurypolos no longer needs their protection, he addresses them as friends, leaders, and commanders (φίλοι, ἡγήτορες, μέδοντες). This is typical: nowhere in battle do warriors address one another as *hetairoi*. As discussed in Chapter 1, Homer simply describes warriors as *hetairoi* when they act as *hetairoi*. Indeed, the vocative of *hetairoi* appears only twice in the *Iliad*, both times referring to the exceptionally tight-knit Myrmidons.²¹ But the warriors near Eurypolos need no explicit appeal to *hetaireia*. As soon as Ajax reaches them (594-595), he is safe enough to turn and stand fast (στῆ δὲ μεταστρεφθείς). As soon as the warriors actually offer help again, they are again called *hetairoi* (ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων).

The phrase “ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο” comes up most densely by far in Book 13 – five appearances total, of which four are clustered within 115 lines.²² By contrast, the phrase appears no more than once in any other book. There is good poetic reason for this: the repetition of ἄψ δ’ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο encapsulates the whole action of Book 13. The topic of Book 13 is the Achaean retreat (ἐχάζετο) from Hector's attack on the camp. The wall no longer protects them, but the Trojans are not yet burning the ships. The Achaean army is in retreat, but the army is not destroyed. Accordingly, in four out of five cases, the hero retreating into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων is Achaean. Each warrior remains alive, but the tide of battle does not turn.²³

²¹ *Iliad* 16.270 (Patroclus to the Myrmidons before entering battle); 23.6 (Achilles to the Myrmidons after killing Hector). Both passages are discussed in detail below.

²² The cluster: Meriones twice retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων (*Iliad* 13.165, 533) within four hundred lines. Thirty-three lines after his second retreat (13.566), Antilochus retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, just before Meriones defends him with a spear-throw. After another thirty-three lines, Menelaus retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων when his rampage is finally checked by Trojan archery. Finally, at 13.648, the Trojan Harpalion's attack is thwarted by Menelaus' shield, and Harpalion retreats into the band of his *hetairoi*.

²³ The fifth and final retreat into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων belongs to a Trojan (Harpalion: *Iliad* 13.648). The sequence of retreats into the band of *hetairoi* thus iconically prefigures the eventual outcome of the Trojan assault: the Trojan

1.2.2 *Peripateia* and the ἔθνος ἐταίρων

In most cases, the ἔθνος ἐταίρων simply offers safety – just as *hetairoi* in general act more on defense than on offense. But at three key moments in the *Iliad*, the arrival of the hero at the ἔθνος ἐταίρων actually reverses the course of battle.²⁴ In each case the turning of the battle marks a turning in the plot. This is expressed formulaically by the whole-line phrase “στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων,” which appears only at these three moments.

The first turning-point leads to Patroclus’ return. At *Iliad* 11.595, Ajax has almost been routed. Eurypylos speaks up to inspire the Achaean leaders (ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες) to come to Ajax’s defense. They stand around Ajax, covering him with their shields:

ὦς ἔφατ’ Εὐρύπυλος βεβλημένος· οἱ δὲ παρ’ αὐτὸν

πλησίοι ἔστησαν σάκε’ ὅμοισι κλίναντες

δούρατ’ ἀνασχόμενοι· τῶν δ’ ἀντίος ἦλυθεν Αἴας.

στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς, ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων.

(*Iliad* 11.592-595)

The pause in battle caused by Ajax’s reversal amid the ἔθνος ἐταίρων gives Nestor a chance to leave the battle, which leads Achilles to ask Patroclus (called *hetairos* at *Iliad* 11.602) to check

attack will eventually be thwarted by the return of the Myrmidons, forcing the Trojans to retreat after a long series of Achaean retreats.

²⁴ *Iliad* 11.595; 15.591; 17.114.

on the wounded Makhaon (11.608-615) – which eventually leads Patroclus to request Achilles’ armor.²⁵

As the first reversal leads to Patroclus’ critical decision at the human level, the second reversal occasions the same *peripateia* at the divine level. At *Iliad* 15.591, Antilochus turns, stands, and fights Hector when he reaches the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. At this moment Zeus’ plan reappears, linking Hector’s success with his death:

στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς, ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων.

Τρῶες δὲ λείουσιν ἐοικότες ὠμοφάγοισι

νηυσὶν ἐπεσσεύοντο, Διὸς δ’ ἐτέλειον ἐφετμάς,

ὃ σφισιν αἰὲν ἔγειρε μένος μέγα, θέλγε δὲ θυμὸν

Ἀργείων καὶ κῦδος ἀπαίνυτο, τοὺς δ’ ὀρόθυνεν.

Ἕκτορι γὰρ οἱ θυμὸς ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι

Πριαμίδῃ, ἵνα νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν θεσπιδαῆς πῦρ

ἐμβάλοι ἀκάματον, **Θέτιδος δ’ ἐξαΐσιον ἀρῆν**

πᾶσαν ἐπικρήνειε· τὸ γὰρ μένε μητίετα Ζεὺς

νηὸς καιομένης σέλας ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ιδέσθαι.

(*Iliad* 15.591-600)

²⁵ See Arieti 1983 for this moment as the critical point in the Iliadic plot.

As soon as Antilochus turns, Zeus plans to give Hector courage and victory – a victory that will eventually drive Hector to attack Patroclus – in order to accomplish what Thetis requested. The temporary reversal caused by the arrival of Antilochus' *hetairoi* is thus both a proleptic echo (as an image of reversal against Hector) and an incidental prerequisite (as an occasion of Zeus' intervention) of Hector's defeat at Achilles' hands.

The third reversal caused by the ἔθνος ἐταίρων leads to the return of Achilles, the final turning-point in the Iliadic plot. At *Iliad* 17.114, the arrival of the band of *hetairoi* gives the Achaeans their first glimmer of hope in the battle over Patroclus' corpse. Menelaus has just retreated from the corpse, all but defeated. But then he finds safety in the band of *hetairoi*:

ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο κίε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος.

στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων

παπταίνων Αἴαντα μέγαν Τελαμώνιον υἱόν.

τὸν δὲ μάλ' αἶψ' ἐνόησε μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πάσης

θαρσύνονθ' ἐτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι

θεσπέσιον γάρ σφιν φόβον ἔμβαλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·

βῆ δὲ θέειν, εἴθαρ δὲ παριστάμενος ἔπος ηὔδα.

Αἴαν δεῦρο πέπον, περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος

σπεύσομεν, αἶ κε νέκυν περ Ἀχιλλῆϊ προφέρωμεν

γυμνόν· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἴκτωρ.

(*Iliad* 17.114-122)

Support in battle, both physical and moral, moves both to and from hero and *hetairoi*. First Menelaus turns and stands fast: the ἔθνος ἐταίρων gives the hero the courage to fight again. Then he looks at Ajax and sees him encouraging the *hetairoi*: and the *hetairoi* receive courage from the hero. Catching the wave of reversal, Menelaus asks Ajax to help him. The combination of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων giving courage to one hero with another hero giving courage to the *hetairoi* is enough to drive Hector away.

One group of *hetairoi* (noun+ ἐταίρων) is called something other than ἔθνος ἐταίρων. This exception is significant for the way it characterizes Hector and the tone it sets for the battle over Patroclus' corpse. When Hector is driven away by Menelaus and Ajax (in the passage just discussed), he retreats into his own group of *hetairoi*.

Αἴας δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων σάκος ἥντε πύργον·

Ἐκτωρ δ' ἄψ ἐς ὄμιλον ἰὼν ἀνεχάζεθ' ἐταίρων,

ἐς δίφρον δ' ἀνόρουσε· δίδου δ' ὃ γε τεύχεα καλά

Τρωσὶ φέρειν προτὶ ἄστν, μέγα κλέος ἔμμεναι αὐτῷ.

Αἴας δ' ἀμφὶ Μενoitιάδῃ σάκος εὐρὺ καλύψας

(*Iliad* 17.128-132)

These *hetairoi* protect Hector, but they are a mass (ὄμιλον), not an ἔθνος. Whereas ἔθνος signifies a kind of dynamic unity caused by individuals moving together (albeit with reference to one another, not to some overarching order), ὄμιλος signifies only a tumultuous mob.²⁶ While the

²⁶ ὄμιλος can mean any assembled group, but in Iliadic battle it especially signifies the throng of massed warriors fighting on foot, as opposed to the individual heroes fighting (or immediately departed) from chariots. The etymology is probably ὁμός+ἴλη. Whereas *swe- signifies reflexivity (i.e. reference of one to another), *sem-

Achaean ἔθνος ἐταίρων reverses Menelaus' retreat, this Trojan ὄμιλος ἐταίρων merely gives Hector space to leap onto his chariot and withdraw. Ajax stands above Patroclus' corpse, covering it with his shield.²⁷ The Trojans never fully dislodge him. Achaean *hetaireia* proves stronger than Hector's efforts to seize Patroclus' corpse, and even receives additional help from the gods: a few lines later Zeus himself rouses the Achaean *hetairoi*.²⁸

1.3 Paradoxical helplessness: the ἔθνος ἐταίρων at Patroclus' death

In all cases but one, the retreating warrior finds safety when he retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. The only exception is Patroclus. The reliability of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, perfect in all cases but one, magnifies the *pathos* of Patroclus' doom and allows the poet to create shock even though Patroclus' death is inevitable.

The failure of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων in *Iliad* 16 is unprecedented but not unprepared. Two books earlier Homer prefigures Patroclus' death at Hector's hands with Hector's near-death at Ajax's hands. *Iliad* 14 describes the first chink in the armor of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. In the middle of the last battle in *Iliad* 14, just before Zeus sets in motion his plan to return Achilles to battle, Hector's spear-cast has just bounced off Ajax's shield. Hector sees that he is powerless without his weapon and retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων:

signifies unity simply, i.e., without reference to any relation – as in Greek εἶς, English *same*, Old Norse *samr* ('same'), Latin *simplex*, *similis* – and especially the constitutive unity of a group, as in Sanskrit *sám* ('together'), Greek ἅμα, σύν, Latin *simul*, *assimilare*, Old Norse *saman* ('together'), Lithuanian *sù* ('with'). Thus the ὄμιλος is a group *simpliciter*, not specifically a group of reflexively and/or anaphorically painted warriors acting together (the ἔθνος ἐταίρων). For massed Iliadic combat see especially Albrecht 1886 and Latacz 1977; more bibliography appears in the general introduction.

²⁷ For σάκος as a 'self-in-battle' see Nagy 1990, 264-265 (drawing on the Hittite cognate *tweka*). For the invincibility of the Homeric σάκος see Bershadsky 2010 (whose argument treats Ajax's σάκος in particular).

²⁸ *Iliad* 17.273: τὸ καὶ οἱ ἀμυνέμεν ὥρσεν ἐταίρους.

...χώσατο δ' Ἴκτωρ,

ὅττι ῥά οἱ βέλος ὠκὺ ἐτώσιον ἔκφυγε χειρός,

ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἀλεείνων.

(*Iliad* 14.406-408)

Hector retreats to re-arm amid the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, like three heroes in the previous book.²⁹ For a moment Hector is safe (κῆρ' ἀλεείνων) – but only for a moment, as Ajax launches a huge stone that flies past the protecting *hetairoi* (409-418). Hector is almost fatally wounded, but his *hetairoi* surround him with a circle of shields (περίβησαν...ἀσπίδας εὐκύκλους σχέθον αὐτοῦ) and carry him from the field in their hands (τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐταῖροι / χερσὶν ἀείραντες φέρον ἐκ πόνου: 428-429). For the first time, an attack penetrates the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. Immediately the *hetairoi* bring the hero to safety. The Trojan ἔθνος ἐταίρων does not protect Hector from injury, but it does protect him from death.

The Achaean ἔθνος ἐταίρων cannot do the same for Patroclus. After Apollo strips him of his armor and Euphorbus wounds him, Patroclus retreats into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. Although he is injured and without arms, the formula for retreat into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων elsewhere signifies safety for both weaponless and seriously wounded heroes. But Hector pierces through the group of *hetairoi*:

...οὐδ' ὑπέμεινε

Πάτροκλον γυμνὸν περ ἐόντ' ἐν δηϊοτήτι.

²⁹ Meriones (*Iliad* 13.165); Adamas (13.566); Harpalion (13.648).

Πάτροκλος δὲ θεοῦ πληγῇ καὶ δουρὶ δαμασθεῖς

ἄψ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἄλεείνων.

Ἴκτωρ δ' ὥς εἶδεν Πατροκλῆα μεγάθυμον

ἄψ ἀναχαζόμενον βεβλημένον ὀξείῃ χαλκῷ,

ἀγχίμολόν ῥά οἱ ἦλθε κατὰ στίχας, οὗτα δὲ δουρὶ

νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα, διὰ πρὸ δὲ χαλκὸν ἔλασσε.

(*Iliad* 16.814-821)

The adversative at the beginning of line 817 refutes the expectation of safety suggested by the formula “ἄψ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἄλεείνων.” Patroclus momentarily escapes death (κῆρ' ἄλεείνων); but then Hector (Ἴκτωρ δ') sees him. The ἔθνος ἐταίρων does not even delay Hector's assaults: he cuts directly through the rather organized protection (ἦλθε κατὰ στίχας) offered by the band of *hetairoi*. As he breaks through the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, he pierces (οὗτα) Patroclus and kills him. The expectation of safety in the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, set from the first appearance of the formula in Book 3, is maintained until this moment. The literary effect of the formula is complicated by the fact that Patroclus is already stripped by a god and wounded by a warrior, and by the promises of doom offered earlier in the narrative. The safety suggested is paradoxical, to great poetic effect: the semantic weight of the formula tells against Patroclus' death, but the audience already knows that he will die. Even the ἔθνος ἐταίρων is helpless against Hector. The semantic charge of the phrase “ἄψ ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο” allows Homer to generate shock at Patroclus' death, despite its inevitability, and wonder at Hector's exceptional

killing power. Now even the quarter implied by this formula is gone. Its significance shattered and its poetic purpose served, the phrase appears no more in the *Iliad*.

2. Leading groups of *hetairoi*

Insofar as the ἔθνος ἑταίρων protects a wounded or vulnerable hero, its primary military function is defensive. As the word *hetairos* describes warriors specifically when they protect, defend, or lament other warriors in battle, so also the phrase “ἔθνος ἑταίρων” describes groups of warriors specifically when they act to defend a retreating hero. When heroes lead *hetairoi* in offensive maneuvers, the phrase “ἔθνος ἑταίρων” does not appear. In both offensive and defensive contexts, the ἔθνος ἑταίρων is not a military unit, nor do *hetairoi* appear in any military structure.³⁰ Iliadic heroes lead *hetairoi* by rousing, persuasion, and encouragement, not by virtue of their office.³¹ This is consistent with the bidirectional character of *hetaireia*, whereby the difference in strength between hero and *hetairoi* does not result in any difference in affection or obligation. Groups of *hetairoi* are comrades, not subordinates.

2.1 No *hetaireia* by rank: the absence of *hetairoi* from the Homeric Catalogues

Hetaireia is not part of any military organization. The Catalogues in *Iliad* 2 and 3 describe both Achaean and Trojan armies but make no mention of *hetairoi*. The leaders are named, and each leader’s relation to his contingent is described by a verb indicating authority.

³⁰ The Myrmidons would seem to be an exception: they are called *hetairoi* as a group, and some are called *hetairoi* when the structure of the group is being described explicitly. But the Myrmidons are an exceptionally tight-knit group. The word *hetairoi* describes the special intimacy of these companions, not a uniquely formal military structure. See discussion under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons” below.

³¹ See discussion in general introduction for scholarship on military structure (or lack thereof) in the *Iliad*. For *hetaireia* as informal, subjective military fraternity see Naiden 2007, 43-45. For the informality of assemblies see Beck 2005, chapter 5.

Most of these verbs do not appear in battle narratives. Authority over a contingent is not the same leadership in battle, just as military organization does not activate *hetaireia* before battle.

Both Catalogues claim to be complete. The Catalogue of Ships is supposed to represent the entire Achaean army, inasmuch as the poet declares that he could never name all the leaders and commanders without the help of the Muses:

εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο

θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον·

ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας.

(*Iliad* 2.491-493)

The interrogative ὅσοι requests enumeration, and the strengthened form προπάσ appears nowhere else in the *Iliad*. The Muses recall every commander and every ship. And the Catalogue closes with an encapsulation:

οὔτοι ἄρ' ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν.

(*Iliad* 2.760)

The deictic with ἄρα suggests completeness.³² Warriors not named ἡγεμόνες in the Catalogue are named ἡγεμόνες later in the *Iliad*, but the word may retain some of its verbal force (ἄγ-) and thus may be used simply to describe individuals who lead others.³³

³² ἄρα commonly appears in Homeric enumerations (LSJ s.v.).

³³ Van Wees 1986, 288, with bibliography in n17. Van Wees suggests that commanders listed in the Catalogue may have sub-commanders named *hegemones* elsewhere, but insofar as there is no textual evidence to distinguish between someone who happens to be leading warriors in battle and someone whose is formally designated as a leader in battle, it seems gratuitous to speculate on 'subdivision of leadership'.

Warriors are also not designated *hetairoi* in the Catalogue of Trojans and Allies that follows. This Catalogue does not contain an explicit request to the Muses for “all” (πρόπας) contingents, but it does close with a similarly suggestive encapsulation:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι...

(*Iliad* 3.1)

In Homer and elsewhere, ἕκαστοι often implies that all particulars are exhausted.³⁴ Every commander is named, but in Catalogues they are called ἡγεμών, ὄρχαμος, ἀρχός, and ἥρωζ, not *hetairos*.³⁵

2.2 Norms of Iliadic leadership: κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω

When heroes do lead groups of *hetairoi*, they so do by persuasion and encouragement, never appealing to any hierarchical system of command and control.³⁶ Leadership of *hetairoi* is usually signified by κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω.³⁷ Each of these verbs reveals a different aspect of how heroes lead groups of *hetairoi*. The following examples are typical of each of the three normal verbs of combat leadership in the *Iliad*.

³⁴ LSJ s.v.

³⁵ The Catalogues designate most leaders by verbs, not nouns, but many are cognate. The analysis of leadership in the appendix includes both Catalogues.

³⁶ The absence of formal command and control does not necessarily imply the absence of any kind of order or direction in battle. *Contra* e.g. Finley 1978, 74 (which conflates ‘commands’ with ‘gives orders’), heroes sometimes do describe specific courses of action (although usually they do not). For summary of scholarship on Iliadic battle see general introduction. For an explicit case of goal-directed self-organization see *Iliad* 12.8487. Even Agamemnon, for all his authoritarianism in council, does not appeal to command authority in battle.

³⁷ This does not exhaust the general vocabulary of Iliadic command, which includes terms (*arkh-*, *heg/ag-*) that encode a stronger notion of authority than the notion expressed by verbs taking *hetairoi* as object. See appendix for complete tabular summary of Iliadic command broken down by agent, patient, content, and circumstances of command. For titles of commanders in the Catalogue of Ships see Donlan 1979, 67n6.

In the *Iliad*, κέλομαι means “exhort” or “encourage” without any coercive force.³⁸ Two passages makes this particularly clear. The first in in Book 12, when Ajax exhorts the nearby Achaeans to κέλομαι one another:

ὦ φίλοι Ἀργείων ὅς τ' ἔξοχος ὅς τε μεσήεις

ὅς τε χειριότερος, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶ πάντες ὅμοιοι

ἄνδρες ἐν πολέμῳ, νῦν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἅπασι·

καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ τόδε πῶ γινώσκετε. μή τις ὀπίσσω

τετράφθω ποτὶ νῆας ὁμοκλητῆρος ἀκούσας,

ἀλλὰ πρόσω ἴεσθε καὶ ἀλλήλοισι κέλεσθε...

(*Iliad* 12.269-274)

Ajax divides the warriors into “outstanding, middling, and worse” (ὅς τ' ἔξοχος ὅς τε μεσήεις / ὅς τε χειριότερος) and explains this tripartite division by appeal to the inequality of humans with respect to war (ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶ πάντες ὅμοιοι / ἄνδρες ἐν πολέμῳ). Despite this natural inequality, the warriors must exhort one another (ἀλλήλοισι κέλεσθε). The stronger are not *ipso facto* granted any authority to command.³⁹

³⁸ Representative examples: *Iliad* 11.91; 13.489; 15.501; 16.268, 524; 18.343 (but see appendix for complete list). The semantic range of κέλομαι helps *Iliad* 15.500 hint at a contrast between Ajax's and Hector's relationships with *hetairoi*. Ajax counters Hector's encouraging speech (which is not addressed to *hetairoi*) by commanding (κέλομαι) *hetairoi* (Αἴας δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐκέκλετο οἷς ἐτάροισιν·) and telling them that they must now save the ships if they are to save themselves. In this speech Ajax describes Hector's speech as ‘rousing the whole *laos*’, not rousing the *hetairoi* (ὀτρύνοντος... λαὸν ἅπαντα / Ἔκτορος).

³⁹ Homer's armies lack both operational and tactical complexity, so initiative naturally remains at the level of the individual soldier, as Ajax observes in this passage. Cf. also *Iliad* 15.658, where hard-pressed Achaeans act as Ajax hopes they will (ἄζηγες γὰρ ὁμόκλεον ἀλλήλοισι).

The second illustrative use of κέλομαι comes in Book 11, just before Agamemnon's *aristeia* begins. Zeus has begun to stir the Achaeans with Eris, and the Achaean onslaught is terrible. Just before Agamemnon appears, the Achaeans "exhort the *hetairoi* by row" (κεκλόμενοι ἑτάροισι κατὰ στίχας: *Iliad* 11.91). Again the exhorters are plural, and nobody is set apart to do the exhorting. Agamemnon is first in battle (πρῶτος: 92), but he kills without exhorting *hetairoi*. The Achaean *hetairoi* do not need Agamemnon in order to exhort one another.

Compared with κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω indicates a more aggressive but less directive kind of exhortation. In Homer, the specific meaning of ὀτρύνω is something like "excite" or "stir";⁴⁰ that is, it drives the listener to increased intensity without suggesting a new object or direction.⁴¹

The meaning of both κέλομαι and ὀτρύνω is clear in Glaukos' prayer to Apollo, just after Sarpedon's death:

...δὸς δὲ κράτος, ὄφρ' ἑτάροισι

κεκλόμενος Λυκίοισιν ἐποτρύνω πολεμίζειν

(*Iliad* 16.524-525)

Glaukos is seriously wounded, but he must protect Sarpedon's corpse. In order to do this, he must call on and rouse (κεκλόμενος...ἐποτρύνω) the Lykian *hetairoi*; and to do this, he needs

⁴⁰ E.g. *Iliad* 10.38, 556 (Hector); 12.50 (Hector, also entreating (*lissomai*) *hetairoi* to cross the ditch); 13.480 (Idomeneus, asking several named *hetairoi* for help against Aeneas' onslaught), 767 (Paris: also encouraging (*tharsuno*) *hetairoi*); 16.525 (though *hetairoi* are grammatical object of the participle *keklomenos*); 17.117 (Ajax, when Menelaus sees him and needs his help to protect Patroclus' corpse, using the same phrase as Paris in book 13), 683 (Antilokhos, when Menelaus sees him).

⁴¹ See appendix for the sometimes directive character of rousings signified by κέλομαι versus the usually non-directive character of rousings signified by ὀτρύνω.

additional strength (κράτος) from the god. God-given κράτος would not be needed if κέλομαι meant simply “command.” Rather, κράτος is needed for the “stirring up” signified by ὀτρύνω because Iliadic commanders rouse by injecting their own energy into the fray.

Explicit encouragement of *hetairoi*, expressed by the verb θαρσύνω,⁴² does not occur as often as rousing and stirring.⁴³ But when *hetairoi* do receive θάρσος from a commanding hero, the situation is either notably pathetic or particularly important to the plot.⁴⁴ Three instances make this particularly clear.

The first case of θάρσος given to a *hetairos* is also the most affecting. Immediately after Sarpedon names his dear *hetairos*, as he lies mortally wounded by Patroclus, he tells his *hetairos* to be a courageous spearman and warrior:

... φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον·

Γλαῦκε πέπον πολεμιστὰ μετ' ἀνδράσι νῦν σε μάλα χρῆ

αἰχμητήν τ' ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέον πολεμιστήν...

(*Iliad* 16.491-493)

Sarpedon's deeply pathetic speech closes with a request that Glaukos protect his corpse, an appeal to what the *hetairos* must give the dead hero. But it begins with the dying hero giving

⁴² The form is the causal of θαρσέω, which is simply the verbal form of θάρσος/θράσύς. In the *Iliad*, θάρσ- is almost always a good thing; but outside the *Iliad*, and even in the *Odyssey*, the root often connotes excess, as also in other reflexes of the Indo-European root (**dhers-*): Sanskrit *dhṛs-* (bold, sometimes dangerously), Germanic *da(u)r(e)* (dare).

⁴³ θαρσύνω takes *hetairoi* as object in only four passages (*Iliad* 13.767; 17.117, 683; 18.325). At 16.493, Sarpedon uses the adjective θαρσαλέος to describe what he hopes Glaukos will be after his death.

⁴⁴ This selective usage seems consistent with the danger and ‘edginess’ suggested by later Greek usage (as well as the etymological sense). θάρσ- appears when warriors take great risks that may turn out poorly.

Glaukos the courage any hero gives his *hetairoi* in battle. Because Sarpedon is dying, his words are less stirring or rousing and more simply a supportive wish. The mortally wounded hero has no κράτος left to give. But Glaukos has just been named Sarpedon's *hetairos*. When *hetaireia* is activated, he does not need additional κράτος from the hero in order to fight with courage, as it is necessary for him to do (σε μάλα χρή).

The second case of explicit encouragement of a *hetairos*, this time signified by θαρσύνω, highlights the bidirectionality of *hetaireia*. The passage has already been discussed above as an example of a reversal caused by a hero's arrival at the ἔθνος ἐταίρων. When Menelaus momentarily withdraws from Patroclus' corpse, the safety offered to a beleaguered hero by the arrival of the ἔθνος ἐταίρων combines with the encouragement given by a hero to faltering *hetairoi*:

ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο κίε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος.

στῇ δὲ μεταστρεφθεὶς ἐπεὶ ἵκετο ἔθνος ἐταίρων

παπταίνων Αἴαντα μέγαν Τελαμώνιον υἱόν.

τὸν δὲ μάλ' αἶψ' ἐνόησε μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πάσης

θαρσύνονθ' ἐτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι

(*Iliad* 17.113-117)

Fresh from salvation via the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, Menelaus sees Ajax encouraging his *hetairoi* and rousing them to fight. In five lines, one band of *hetairoi* has reversed the retreat of one hero and another group of *hetairoi* has received θάρσος from a different hero. The meeting of the two heroes begins the Achaean counterattack for Patroclus' corpse. After a terrible struggle, the

counterattack by courageous *hetairoi* eventually succeeds – an outcome that the *Iliad* had spent the previous hundred and fifteen lines painting as desperately improbable. The effect of this mutual encouragement is that both hero and *hetairoi* stand firm over Patroclus’ corpse, never again to be driven away completely.

The last mention of θαρσύνω in connection with *hetaireia* is full of tragic irony deriving from the meaning of hands in Homer. The warrior encouraged is the father of the dearest dead *hetairos*, and the encouragement is in vain:

τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης ἀδινούῃ ἐξήρχε γόοιο

χεῖρας ἐπ’ ἀνδροφόνους θέμενος στήθεσσιν ἑταίρου

...

ὧς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν·

ὦ πόποι ἦ ῥ’ ἄλιον ἔπος ἔκβαλον ἥματι κείνῳ

θαρσύνων ἥρωα Μενόιτιον ἐν μεγάροισι.

(*Iliad* 18.316-317, 323-325)

Achilles places his characteristically man-killing hands (χεῖρας ἀνδροφόνους) on the chest of his dead *hetairos*, whom another man-killer (ἀνδροφόνος Ἔκτωρ) has just slain. The irony is richer and more specific than simple juxtaposition of strong hands and powerless body. Hands are linked with *hetaireia* and death in three other Iliadic passages, all of which display a similar kind of tragic irony that at least partly depends on the poetic ambivalence of hands. At *Iliad* 4.154, Agamemnon grasps Menelaus’ hand while the *hetairoi* groan at his apparent death (χειρὸς ἔχων Μενέλαον, ἐπεστενάχοντο δ’ ἑταῖροι). Here the irony is that Agamemnon and *hetairoi* do not

know that Menelaus' wound is not fatal, as the Homeric audience has just been told. At *Iliad* 5.574, Menelaus and Antilochus place the corpses of two of Aeneas' most recent victims into the hands of *hetairoi* (τὼ μὲν ἄρα δειλὼ βαλέτην ἐν χερσὶν ἐταίρων) – the reverse of the situation in Book 18, where the hands belong to the living *hetairoi* and the corpse belongs to dead warriors not called *hetairoi*. But the most powerful image of hands and *hetaireia* occurs at *Iliad* 13.548-549, where a dying Thoon silently spreads his hands to his dear *hetairoi*, a last gasp of *hetaireia* before the hero dies in the sand (ὃ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν κονίῃσι / κάππεσεν, ἄμφω χεῖρε φίλοις ἐτάροισι πετάσας).

Achilles' placement of man-killing hands on the chest of his dead *hetairos* gains similar *pathos* from the ironic juxtaposition of strength and helplessness. But the encouragement he narrates injects another level of tragic irony. The recipient of Achilles' encouragement was not Patroclus, but Patroclus' father Menoitios. The courage Achilles once gave Menoitios is now useless (ἄλιος). The recollection of Patroclus' father prefigures the subsequent deaths of Hector and of Achilles himself. As Menoitios will mourn his dead son Patroclus, so Priam will mourn Hector and Peleus will mourn Achilles. Thus here, with hands on his dead *hetairos* and mind on the futility of θαρσύνω, Achilles first introduces the kind of transitive sympathy joining bereaved fathers and dead sons that finally calms his rage in Book 24.

2.3 Extremes of Iliadic leadership: ἀγείρω and λίσσομαι

While κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω express the normal in-battle relationship between a commanding hero and a group of *hetairoi*, the verbs ἀγείρω and λίσσομαι represent rare extremes. When ἀγείρω (gather, collect) takes *hetairoi* as object (in just two passages, both direct

speech), the context is accusatory and the result of gathering *hetairoi* is catastrophic.⁴⁵ When λίσσομαι (beg, entreat, supplicate) takes *hetairoi* as object, the context is anticipatory and the supplication of the *hetairoi* is successful.⁴⁶

Both instances of ἀγείρω with *hetairoi* as object are serious accusations. In the first, Hector accuses Paris of ruining Troy. In the second, Paris accuses Hector of destroying *hetairoi*.

Early in Book 3, when Paris shrinks back into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων in fear of Menelaus, Hector upbraids his brother; but the scope of his reproach extends well beyond the cowardice Paris has just displayed. The defender of Troy accuses his brother of bringing their father, the city, and the people great suffering:

ἦ τοιόσδε ἐὼν ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι
πόντον ἐπιπλώσας, **ἐτάρους ἐρήρας ἀγείρας,**
μιχθεὶς ἄλλοδαποῖσι γυναῖκ' εὐεῖδέ' ἀνήγες
ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης νυὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητῶν
πατρί τε σῶ μέγα πῆμα πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ,
δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ;
(*Iliad* 3.46-51)

⁴⁵ *Iliad* 3.47 (Hector to Paris); 13.779 (Paris to Hector). In other Homeric contexts the object of ἀγείρω (most commonly λαός) is generally passive and the connotation of the verb is neutral. To perform ἀγείρω seem to be harmful only when the object is *hetairoi* in particular. (For the passivity of the λαός see especially Haubold 2000, chapters 1 and 2.)

⁴⁶ Representative examples: *Iliad* 9.581 (family and *hetairoi* to Meleager), 21.71 (family and *hetairoi* to Hector), 22.418 (Priam to bystanders), 24.357 (Priam to Achilles). See Naiden 2005 for comprehensive treatment of supplication in Homer, including detailed discussion of λίσσομαι.

The mention of *hetairoi* is tangential to the substance of Hector's charge; the use of the phrase "ἐτάρους ἐρίρας ἀγείρας" serves a rhetorical and poetic purpose. Paris' wrongdoing is the theft of Helen and her transport to Troy. The *hetairoi* scarcely participated in the crime and Hector never blames anyone but Paris. But Paris' most recent retreat resembles another, a more destructive act of cowardice. As he now shrinks back into the ἔθνος ἐταίρων, so he earlier carried his stolen wife into the city that now risks itself to defend him. As Paris is now bringing ruin to Troy by keeping Helen within the walls, so also he gathered (ἀγείρας) his *hetairoi* for his wife-stealing trip to Sparta. The result of this gathering of *hetairoi*, two steps removed, is the present disaster.

The second use of ἀγείρω with *hetairoi* as object swaps the accuser and the accused. Just as Hector blames Paris in Book 3 for endangering the city by capturing Helen with the help of gathered *hetairoi*, so Paris blames Hector in Book 13 for gathering and leading *hetairoi* to their doom:

Ἔκτορ ἐπεὶ τοι θυμὸς ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι,
ἄλλοτε δὴ ποτε μᾶλλον ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο
μέλλω, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ πάμπαν ἀνάγκιδα γείνατο μήτηρ·
ἐξ οὗ γὰρ παρὰ νηυσὶ μάχην ἤγειρας ἐταίρων,
ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἐνθάδ' ἐόντες ὀμιλέομεν Δαναοῖσι
νωλεμέως· ἔταροι δὲ κατέκταθεν οὗς σὺ μεταλλάξ.

(*Iliad* 13.775-780)

Here the blameworthy party is Hector, and again the use of ἀγείρω with *hetairoi* as object points to the crime. In Book 3, Paris' harm was to Troy; in Book 13, Hector's harm is to his *hetairoi* themselves. Just as in Hector's accusation Paris' gathering of *hetairoi* presaged the destruction of Troy, so also here in Paris' accusation Hector's gathering of *hetairoi* for battle (μάχην ἡγείρας ἐταίρων) results in the deaths of the *hetairoi* he leads (ἔταροι δὲ κατέκταθεν οὓς σὺ μεταλλάξ).

The narrative context sets Paris' accusation of Hector strongly against Hector's accusation of Paris in Book 3. In Book 13, Paris is responding to a round of abuse from Hector centering on the familiar picture of a beautiful, erotically obsessed, and militarily poor "Bad-Paris" (Δύσπαρι εἶδος ἄριστε γυναιμανὲς ἡπεροπευτά: *Iliad* 13.769). This time Hector raises the stakes by openly threatening Paris' life (νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος: 13.773). But this time the accusation of cowardice is simply false.⁴⁷ When Hector encounters Paris in Book 13, Paris is fighting like any other Iliadic warrior, rousing *hetairoi* in the normal language of heroic leadership:

τὸν δὲ τάχ' εὔρε μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ δακρυοέσεως

δῖον Ἀλέξανδρον Ἑλένης πόσιν ἠϋκόμοιο

θαρσύνονθ' ἐτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι...

(*Iliad* 13.765-767)

Within thirteen lines Paris appears as a successful leader of *hetairoi* and Hector appears as a destroyer of *hetairoi*, an inversion emphasized by the reversal of the accusatory use of ἀγείρω with *hetairoi* as object.

⁴⁷ For the obvious injustice of Hector's charge in this context see McCarthy 1943.

If ἀγείρω signifies selfish abuse of *hetaireia*, λίσσομαι (beg, entreat, supplicate) represents an opposite extreme of respect for *hetairoi*. When a hero gathers (ἀγείρω) *hetairoi*, he leads innocent companions to catastrophe caused by his own foolishness. When he entreats (λίσσομαι) *hetairoi*, they do exactly what he asks. Like the two instances of ἀγείρω with *hetairoi* as object, the two instances of λίσσομαι with *hetairoi* as object form a pair.⁴⁸ In the first passage, Hector entreats his *hetairoi* to begin a particularly ambitious attack. In the second, Achilles entreats his *hetairoi* not to make him eat before he avenges Patroclus.

In battle, λίσσομαι with *hetairoi* neither implies authority nor signifies weakness. The first case demonstrates this clearly. In Book 12, as the Achaeans cower behind their besieged wall, Hector assembles his troops for the assault:

ὥς Ἴκτωρ ἀν' ὄμιλον ἰὼν ἐλλίσσεθ' ἑταίρους

τάφρον ἐποτρύνων διαβαινέμεν...

(*Iliad* 12.49-50)

As Hector assembles the men, he both rouses (ἐποτρύνων) and entreats (ἐλλίσσεθ') the *hetairoi* to cross the ditch. No desperation forces him to entreat rather than command: at the moment his tactical situation is extremely strong. Indeed, the Achaeans have just been described as “shut in next to their hollow ships in fear of Hector, mighty maker of fear” (νηυσὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῇσιν ἐελμένοι ἰσχανόωντο : *Iliad* 12.38-39). Rather, Hector entreats his *hetairoi* because their self-motivation is maximally required when the Trojan force is very close to victory.

⁴⁸ *Iliad* 12.49 (Hector); 19.305 (Achilles).

In battle, a hero can entreat *hetairoi* to attack; apart from battle, a hero can entreat *hetairoi* to consider his emotional state. The second appearance of λίσσομαι with *hetairoi* as object comes in Book 19, just before Achilles returns to combat. Patroclus' death having finally roused him to fight, Achilles is interested only in revenge. The Achaean elders asks him to eat, but he asks them to stop:

αὐτὸν δ' ἄμφι γέροντες Ἀχαιῶν ἠγερέθοντο

λίσσόμενοι δειπνῆσαι· ὃ δ' ἠρνείτο στεναχίζων·

λίσσομαι, εἴ τις ἔμοιγε φίλων ἐπιπείθεθ' ἐταίρων,

μή με πρὶν σίτοιο κελεύετε μηδὲ ποτῆτος

ἄσασθαι φίλον ἦτορ, ἐπεὶ μ' ἄχος αἰνὸν ἰκάνει.

(*Iliad* 19.305-307)

Achilles' use of λίσσομαι echoes the elders' request on the previous line. As if λίσσομαι were not gentle enough, Achilles adds two more levels of non-authority. He concedes that they might not obey/be persuaded by him; but if (εἴ) any of the dear *hetairoi* used to be persuaded (imperfect ἐπιπείθεθ'), then he asks that they not tell him (κελεύετε) to eat. The apodosis of Achilles' conditional admits that commands might go from *hetairoi* to Achilles, since κελεύω frequently signifies direction, even in battle. As soon as Achilles entreats his *hetairoi*, he gives them an explicit reason (ἐπεὶ) for his desire not to eat and drink: terrible grief (ἄχος αἰνόν) has come upon him. He asks his *hetairoi* to consider his personal feelings, and of course they do.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ This interpretation goes against Griffin 1980, 15 (claiming that Achilles simply will not share food with Agamemnon) and Taplin 1992, 211.

With objects other than *hetairoi*, λίσσομαι does sometimes imply that the speaker is speaking from a position of weakness. In Book 15, during the Achaean rout, Nestor entreats warriors who are not called *hetairoi*:

λίσσεθ' ὑπὲρ τοκέων γουνούμενος ἄνδρα ἕκαστον·

ὦ φίλοι ἄνδρες ἔστε καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ

ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, ἐπὶ δὲ μνήσασθε ἕκαστος

παίδων ἢ δ' ἀλόχων καὶ κτήσιος ἢ δὲ τοκῆων.

(*Iliad* 15.660-663)

Here λίσσομαι clearly signifies supplication in battle. Unlike Hector in Book 12, Nestor cannot safely assume that nearby warriors will do what he wants and what is needed for victory. They are in no place to give protection and they expect to receive none. Thus *hetaireia* is not activated, and accordingly these supplicated warriors are not named *hetairoi*. Indeed, Nestor's request explicitly depends on filial piety, not warrior companionship, insofar as he supplicates on behalf of parents (ὑπὲρ τοκέων) and family (παίδων ἢ δ' ἀλόχων καὶ κτήσιος ἢ δὲ τοκῆων).⁵⁰ Nestor's speech rouses the men (ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου: 667), but Nestor's auditors are not given credit for the pause. Athena clears the air and Ajax intervenes to protect the ships, but he is emphatically alone.⁵¹

⁵⁰ This supplication prefigures Priam's supplication of Achilles in Book 24: in both cases, a desperate old man appeals to a young warrior's feelings for his aged parents.

⁵¹ Ajax takes his heroic stand when he finds it unpleasant to remain where the other Achaeans are, i.e., in a rout (οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' Αἴαντι μεγαλήτορι ἦνδανε θυμῷ / ἐστάμεν ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι ἀφέστασαν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν: *Iliad* 15.674-675). The sons of the Achaeans are *amphi* (ἀφέστασαν) but they are not with Ajax, so they are not called *hetairoi*. They retain the dynamic unity of any Iliadic warrior-group, signified by the simile in which they are described as an ἔθνος

Further analysis of leadership in the *Iliad*, classified by verb, context, participants, and content, appears in the appendix. All instances of human leadership are analyzed, whether or not the warriors roused, encouraged, commanded, or entreated are called *hetairoi*.

2.4 Weak *hetaireia* and unsuccessful leadership: Agamemnon and Hector

If heroes normatively lead *hetairoi* by persuasion, successful heroes have good relations with *hetairoi*. The *hetaireia* joining Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons represents the most extreme case, but in general *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* between heroes and surrounding warriors is strong. The two exceptions, Agamemnon and Hector, are significant – each in his own way, both ways serving to characterize Achilles and his *hetairoi* by contrast.

2.4.1 Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans

Agamemnon has *hetairoi*, but his relationship with *hetairoi* is relatively weak. Only one individual, Idomeneus, is unambiguously called his *hetairos*; and even this appellation appears in the future tense, in direct speech, as a result of a past oath, not a dangerous situation in battle (*Iliad* 4.266). Agamemnon never gives or receives combat support to or from a group of *hetairoi*.⁵² He is related to only one group of *hetairoi*, and this group appears in his own speech, in an anomalously divisive utterance, at the moment he foolishly threatens to take Briseis from Achilles (*Iliad* 1.178-187).

of prey-birds under Hector's eagle-like attack (ὥς τ' ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν αἰετὸς αἰθῶν / ἔθνος ἐφορμᾶται: *Iliad* 15.690-691); but they are not called *hetairoi* because to Ajax they are dead weight.

⁵² This argument has the drawbacks of any argument *ex silentio*, but it seems odd that Agamemnon – who is a very successful warrior on the battlefield – should never be related to any *hetairoi* in battle. Menelaus (*Iliad* 10.36-37) and Nestor (10.84) both ask Agamemnon whether he is seeking some indefinite individual among *hetairoi* (τὴν ἑταίρων), but these *hetairoi* do not materialize in the battle narrative.

Only Idomeneus is individually called *hetairos* to Agamemnon (*Iliad* 4.467). Menelaus (10.36-37) and Nestor (84) also ask Agamemnon about a group of *hetairoi* that probably includes Odysseus and Diomedes, but neither is named *hetairos* individually. Idomeneus' relation to Agamemnon as *hetairos* has no parallel. While every other *hetairos* is so called only when acting as *hetairos*, Idomeneus attributes the fact that he will be Agamemnon's *hetairos* in battle to an earlier (τὸ πρῶτον) oath:

Τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἀντίον ἠΐδα·

Ἀτρεΐδῃ μάλα μὲν **τοὶ ἐγὼν ἐρίηρος ἐταῖρος**

ἔσσομαι, ὥς τὸ πρῶτον **ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα**·

ἄλλ' ἄλλους ὄτρυνε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς

ὄφρα τάχιστα μαχώμεθ', ἐπεὶ σύν γ' ὄρκι' ἔχευαν

Τρῶες· τοῖσιν δ' αὖ θάνατος καὶ κήδε' ὀπίσσω

ἔσσει' ἐπεὶ πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια δηλήσαντο.

(*Iliad* 4.265-271)

This passage is unique in two respects. First, no other Iliadic warrior is called *hetairos* because of any past action at any definite time. Second, no other warrior in the *Iliad* becomes *hetairos* deliberately. Thus Idomeneus' bond with Agamemnon, and the support he offers in battle as a result, is unusually dependent on Idomeneus' will, rather than simply on the battlefield situations that normally activate *hetaireia de facto*. The future tense of ἔσσομαι describes the battlefield situation in which Idomeneus will be Agamemnon's *hetairos*, in preparation for which Agamemnon is presently trying to rouse his men. But the cause of this future *hetaireia* is a past

event (τὸ πρῶτον).⁵³ Agamemnon does not receive support from his *hetairos* simply because Idomeneus is fighting nearby. Even the individual warrior who is *hetairos* to Agamemnon in the *Iliad* is not his *hetairos* because of what happens in the *Iliad*.

The peculiarity of Idomeneus' bond as *hetairos* with Agamemnon is a sign that Agamemnon's authority as *wanax* is not sufficient to hold the army together. Idomeneus' army is crucial to the expedition – measuring by size of contingent, Idomeneus and Diomedes are tied for second-greatest king of the Achaeans, each with eighty ships to Agamemnon's one hundred – and its leader is Agamemnon's *hetairos* in a way other than *de facto*. Agamemnon seems to recognize this, insofar as he claims to honor Idomeneus more than any other Danaan:

Ἴδομενεῦ περὶ μὲν σε τίω Δαναῶν ταχυπόλων

ἥμην ἐνὶ πτολέμῳ ἢ δ' ἄλλοιῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ

ἢ δ' ἐν δαίθῳ, ὅτε πέρ τε γερούσιον αἶθοπα οἶνον

Ἀργείων οἳ ἄριστοι ἐνὶ κρητῆρι κέρωνται.

(*Iliad* 4.258-260)

The phrase “περὶ μὲν σε τίω Δαναῶν ταχυπόλων” is charged by the events of Book 1.

Agamemnon's competition with Achilles over *τιμή* has weakened the army tremendously.⁵⁴ But

⁵³ *Contra* e.g. Kirk 1985 *ad loc.* and Zanker 1996, 32, Idomeneus' oath cannot be interpreted as the oath of Helens' suitors. The oath of Tyndareus is absent from the *Iliad* and perhaps suppressed deliberately (if it was indeed part of the Cycle) as confusing or irrelevant to the *menis* of Achilles; in any case no other passage refers to it. For the oath see West 1985; for a more recent explication see Cingano 2005 *passim* but especially 124 (arguing that the oath was also narrated in the Cypria, citing Robert 1920-23: II, 1066-1067; Bethe 1929, 233-2355; *contra* Severyns 1928, 274-275) and 127-133.

⁵⁴ In book 14 Agamemnon seems to recognize that he has offended the rest of the army just as he has offended Achilles: ὦ πόποι ἦ ῥα καὶ ἄλλοι ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ / ἐν θυμῷ βάλλονται ἐμοὶ χόλον ὥς περ Ἀχιλλεύς / οὐδ' ἐθέλουσι μάχεσθαι ἐπὶ πρυμνῆσι νέεσσι. (*Iliad* 14.49-51).

Idomeneus – *hetairos* thanks to a past, non-military event – he honors in both war and every other sort of activity (ἐνὶ πτολέμῳ ἢ δ' ἄλλοίῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ). At the *dais*, where status is most evident, Agamemnon considers Idomeneus his peer:

...σὸν δὲ πλεῖτον δέπας αἰεὶ

ἔστηχ', ὥς περ ἐμοί, πῖεῖν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγοι...

(*Iliad* 4.462-463)

Idomeneus' response to Agamemnon's exhortation thus deftly confirms Agamemnon's trust while asserting Idomeneus' relative independence. Certainly he will fight on Agamemnon's side – because he agreed to be Agamemnon's *hetairos*. It is not necessary for Agamemnon to exhort or flatter him; he can count on Idomeneus to be *hetairos* because of a previous oath. As Idomeneus observes, Agamemnon would do better to exhort other Achaeans.⁵⁵ Agamemnon can trust even the self-declared *hetairos* implicitly.

As Homer grants Agamemnon only one individual *hetairos*, and that *hetairos* is uniquely named *hetairos* not *de facto*, so also Homer gives Agamemnon only one group of *hetairoi*, and that group is uniquely contrasted with another group of *hetairoi* within the army. The group is named in Agamemnon's own words, and the contrast demonstrates his wrong-headedness toward *hetaireia*. Agamemnon names his only plural *hetairoi* in the middle of his most disastrous speech:

⁵⁵ Agamemnon's deep misunderstanding of his army is again evident in Book 2, when he fails to appreciate how much the troops long for home. Even if argument *ex silentio* is not permitted, Agamemnon's total ignorance of his army's morale is an inexcusable error for a commander. By contrast, in Book 16 Achilles admits how much he has harmed the morale of his Myrmidon *hetairoi* and responds accordingly (discussed below). But in Book 1 Achilles' concern for the army is already greater than Agamemnon's, since it is Achilles (albeit inspired by Hera) who calls a council to save the dying army (*Iliad* 1.55-58).

εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἐσσι, θεός που σοὶ τό γ' ἔδωκεν·

οἴκαδ' ἰὼν σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς ἐτάροισι

Μυρμιδόνεσσιν ἄνασσε, σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω,

οὐδ' ὄθομαι κοτέοντος· ἀπειλήσω δέ τοι ὧδε·

ὥς ἔμ' ἀφαιρεῖται Χρυσηίδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,

τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σὺν νηϊ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισι

πέμψω, ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα καλλιπάρηον

αὐτὸς ἰὼν κλισίην δὲ τὸ σὸν γέρας ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῆς

ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, στυγέη δὲ καὶ ἄλλος

ἶσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι καὶ ὁμοιωθῆμεναι ἄντην.

(*Iliad* 1.178-187)

Agamemnon expresses his superiority (φέρτερος) by imagining Achilles returning to “your *hetairoi*” (σοῖς ἐτάροισι) while Agamemnon leads Briseis to “my *hetairoi*” (ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισι). The next step is more aggressive still: the μὲν at line 182, describing Briseis’ arrival among Agamemnon’s ships and *hetairoi*, is followed by the δέ on the next line, signifying her relocation to Agamemnon’s own tent.

This figuring of *hetairoi* as one faction set against and sovereign over another is unique in the *Iliad*. Far from indicating subdivisions in the army, the word *hetairos* can elsewhere signify obligation to the entire army. In Book 12, as Hector drives the Achaeans behind their wall, the Achaeans leave the gate open for any retreating *hetairos*:

τῇ ρ' ἵππους τε καὶ ἄρμα διήλασεν, οὐδὲ πύλησιν

εὖρ' ἐπικεκλιμένας σανίδας καὶ μακρὸν ὄχημα,

ἀλλ' ἀναπεπταμένας ἔχον ἄνδρες, εἴ **τιν' ἑταίρων**

ἐκ πολέμου φεύγοντα σώσειαν μετὰ νῆας.

(*Iliad* 12.120-123)

The *hetairos* in flight is indefinite (τιν' ἑταίρων); the number of τινα is singular. The army is willing to risk the entire camp for any one of the *hetairoi*. For Agamemnon, “your *hetairoi*” and “my *hetairoi*” are at odds, and the disagreement is resolved only by Agamemnon’s personal superiority (ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν).⁵⁶ For the rest of the army, the protection of any *hetairos* is worth risking the entire camp.

Agamemnon’s phrase “ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισι” encapsulates his divisive misappropriation of *hetaireia*. This phrase is also almost unique in the *Iliad*: elsewhere only Achilles calls his *hetairoi* “mine,” and then only twice. But in both cases Achilles’ usage encodes not internal division but rather extreme solidarity. In the first case, Achilles declares that Hector can expect no quarter precisely because he killed “my *hetairoi*.”⁵⁷ In the second case, Achilles appeals to “my *hetairoi*” to lament for Patroclus with him.⁵⁸ For Agamemnon, on the other hand, “my

⁵⁶ For the precariousness of Agamemnon’s position as *wanax* of an expedition full of *basileis*, see Taplin 1990 and 1992, 59-68.

⁵⁷ νῦν δ' ἀθρόα πάντ' ἀποτίσεις / κήδε' ἐμῶν ἐτάρων οὓς ἔκτανες ἔγχεϊ θύων (*Iliad* 22.271-272). Achilles’ connection to one of these *hetairoi* is of course dominant at the moment, but it is nevertheless significant that he chooses to use the plural. See discussion of vengeance in Chapter 1.

⁵⁸ Μυρμιδόνες ταχύπολοι ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι / ...Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν (*Iliad* 23.6, 9).

hetairoi” signifies division within the Achaean forces.⁵⁹ Achilles himself observes how deeply Agamemnon has separated himself from the rest of the army: the bulk of his response to the insult that includes the opposition of “your *hetairoi*” and “my *hetairoi*” is an attack on Agamemnon’s cowardly absence from battle (*Iliad* 1.225-239), deriding him as a people-eating king (δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς) who will not to go war with his army (οὔτέ ποτ’ ἐς πόλεμον ἅμα λαῶ θωρηχθῆναι) while the rest of the warriors risk death.⁶⁰

2.4.2 Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans

If it is clear from Book 1 (and still more obvious from Book 2⁶¹) that Agamemnon is a poor commander, it is less clear that Hector’s failure to protect a doomed city implicates his relationship with the warriors he commands. Moreover, the two supreme commanders do not

⁵⁹ For a recent application of politeness theory to the back-and-forth between warrior and commander, including discussion of how speakers alter the meaning of opponents’ words and phrases, see Scodel 2008, Chapter 3.

⁶⁰ The last five lines of the speech re-focus on the personal slight (*Iliad* 1.240-244), but the closing accusation places Achilles squarely among the rest of the Achaeans as object of Agamemnon’s dishonor (ὃ τ’ ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας: 1.244). Here ‘best of the Achaeans’ does not mean ‘best as opposed to the inferiors’ but rather ‘best among a group from which Agamemnon has habitually separated himself’. For an excellent discussion of Achilles’ objections as offering a warrior’s perspective on an apparently inert king, see Collins 1988, 89-103, with both literary and mythical analyses drawing on Dumézil 1969 via Vian 1968 and Vernant 1974, 28-35. For the Homeric king specifically as redistributor, see Qviller 1981. For the disagreement as political struggle, see especially Zanker 1996, 75-79.

⁶¹ Agamemnon’s test of the army, immediately inspired by a deceptive dream but implying that Agamemnon does not understand what the troops feel at the moment, is such a disaster that analysts have often excluded it as unworthy of Homer (Wilamowitz 1916, 392; von der Mühl 1946; Kullmann 1955, 256) or gravely harmful to the aesthetic value of the entire poem (Lammler 1948, 83); and many commentators simply admit that they cannot explain the episode (e.g. Beye 1966, 123; Willcock 1976, 18: “confusion”; Kirk 1985, 123: “unexpected”; Whitman 1982, 73). Social historians treat the passage as clear evidence of heroic and aristocratic ideology: Donlan 1979; Thalmann 1988 (setting divine and royal interests against one another and somewhat vindicating Achilles); McGlew 1989 (unconvincingly interpreting the trial as success, from Agamemnon’s perspective, insofar as the troops’ shame reinforces royal power); cf. also Knox and Russo 1989 (arguing partly on comparative grounds that Agamemnon intends to purify the army of cowards for a “holy war”). But aristocratic ideology accounts only for Odysseus’ response to Thersites, which would not have been necessary if Agamemnon had not grossly miscalculated in the first place. Literary-minded critics focus on Agamemnon’s incompetence as a king (Kalinka 1943, taking the incompetence as evidence of verism, even portraiture of an actual Mycenaean king; Reinhardt 1961, 107-120) or as a fallible human being (Sheppard 1922, 26: “sign of a disturbed mind”; Lattimore 1959, 46) and sometimes as an unsuccessful reverse psychologist (Finley 1978[1954], 106-107; Whitman 1958, 58; Heubeck 1981, 82).

exhibit the same general flaws. Agamemnon factionalizes his army, and at the beginning of the poem he drives away his greatest warrior. On the other hand, no factions arise in Hector's army, even though many contingents are merely allies (*epikouroi*), and he loses none of his greatest warriors.

While Agamemnon's *hetairoi* play very little role in the plot, Hector has *hetairoi* who consistently protect him in battle and lament him after death.⁶² But Hector does not consistently do the same for his *hetairoi*. Paris openly suggests that Hector is to blame for the deaths of many *hetairoi*.⁶³ What is surprising is that Paris' charge is borne out by Hector's behavior.

For all his virtues as a protector of family and kin, the catalogue of Hector's failures to protect his *hetairoi* is considerable. Five times he does nothing to protect either a wounded *hetairos* or the corpse of a dead *hetairos*.⁶⁴ Twice in Book 8, he grieves at the death of his *hetairos* and does nothing (τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' εἶασε καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταίρου), although in these cases circumstances are dire and nobody blames him for inaction.⁶⁵ Hector protects endangered *hetairoi* only once, and then only for six lines before he abandons them.⁶⁶ He is rebuked for his actions in battle more than any other hero, and three of ten rebukes concern *hetairoi*.⁶⁷ Hector is no coward, for he dies to protect his city; but his chief concern is not his warrior-companions.

⁶² Protect: *Iliad* 14.408, 428-429; 15.240-241, 671; 17.129; 22.240. Lament (along with family): 24.792-794.

⁶³ *Iliad* 13.778-780.

⁶⁴ *Iliad* 5.469-472; 8.124-129; 8.316-319; 17.149-153; 17.587-590.

⁶⁵ *Iliad* 8.118-126, 310-317. This failure perhaps prefigures the desecration of his corpse by Achilles, although of course it does not imply anything about the moral status of the desecration.

⁶⁶ *Iliad* 16.363-369.

⁶⁷ Rebukes that address Hector's failure to protect a warrior explicitly called *hetairos*: *Iliad* 5.472-492 (Sarpedon); 17.149-153 (Glaukos), 587-590 (Apollo). For rebukes that do not call the dead warrior *hetairos* see Moulton 1981 (who counts ten rebukes total) and Kozak 2012 (eight only).

2.4.2.1 Defending *hetairoi* for a moment

The scene in which Hector comes closest to protecting his *hetairoi* begins with an impressive attempt to stand up to his arch-enemy Ajax. Ajax has already bested Hector twice, and in both cases Hector was saved by something outside his control.⁶⁸ In Book 16, Hector's tactical situation is even worse. Several Achaean heroes kill multiple enemies each (*Iliad* 16.351: οὔτοι ἄρ' ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν ἔλον ἄνδρα ἕκαστος) as Patroclus' *aristeia* drives the Trojans back to the city. Great Ajax targets Hector in particular, Hector sees that the tide of battle is turning, but he stands fast in order to save his *hetairoi*:

Αἴας δ' ὃ μέγας αἰὲν ἐφ' Ἑκτορι χαλκοκορυστῇ
ἔειπ' ἀκοντίσσαι· ὃ δὲ ἰδρεῖη πολέμοιο
ἀσπίδι ταυρεῖη κεκαλυμμένος εὐρέας ὦμους
σκέπτειτ' οἷστων τε ροῖζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων.
ἦ μὲν δὴ γίγνωσκε μάχης ἑτεραλκέα νίκην·
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς ἀνέμιμνε, σάω δ' ἐρήρηας ἐταίρους.
(*Iliad* 16.358-363)

The mission is hopeless. Hector recognizes that Patroclus' entry has reversed the course of battle (γίγνωσκε μάχης ἑτεραλκέα νίκην), but he stays anyway (adversative: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς) to save his *hetairoi* (σάω δ' ἐρήρηας ἐταίρους). But this rally goes nowhere. For all his personal bravery,

⁶⁸ *Iliad* 7.270-272: Ajax's stone crushes Hector's shield and knocks him to the ground; Apollo raises him up, but the heralds call the duel a draw. *Iliad* 14.408-439: Ajax's stone again crushes Hector, this time wounding him gravely and forcing his *hetairoi* to carry him back to the river Xanthus.

Hector and the Trojans succumb to *phobos* and run away in disorder.⁶⁹ Nor does Hector's concern for his troops last long. Six lines later, the army in full rout, he leaves the *laos* behind:

ὥς τῶν ἐκ νηῶν γένετο ἰαχὴ τε φόβος τε,
οὐδὲ κατὰ μοῖραν πέραον πάλιν. Ἔκτορα δ' ἵπποι
ἔκφερον ὠκύποδες σὺν τεύχεσι, **λεῖπε δὲ λαὸν**
Τρωϊκόν, οὓς ἀέκοντας ὀρυκτὴ τάφος ἔρυκε.

(*Iliad* 16.366-369)

Uncontrollable forces of battle are now in charge of the battlefield (γένετο ἰαχὴ τε φόβος τε) and Hector himself joins the masses of the fleeing Trojans he was trying to protect. Patroclus' *aristeia* is unstoppable, and nobody blames Hector for running. But his attempt to save his *hetairoi* does not last long.

Hector's flight is understandable but not inevitable. Fifty lines later, the Trojan situation no less precarious, in a passage already discussed in Chapter 1 (*Iliad* 16.415-422), Sarpedon stands up to Patroclus himself in order to save his *hetairoi*. Every hero in his *aristeia* is invincible; but Patroclus' *aristeia* is the most dominant of all until Achilles himself returns. Sarpedon's attempt to protect his *hetairoi* gets him killed in spite of Zeus' private wishes. His death scene is one of the most deeply affecting illustrations of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*.⁷⁰ Thus, without demeaning Hector for his understandable flight, Homer shows a difference between a

⁶⁹ Patroclus specifically targets the clusters of warriors that result from the disorderly retreat (Πάτροκλος δ' ἦ πλεῖστον ὀρινόμενον ἶδε λαόν, / τῇ ῥ' ἔχ' ὁμοκλήσας: *Iliad* 16.377-378).

⁷⁰ For this scene see Chapter 1, under "The *pathos* of *hetaireia* I: Sarpedon's death." Sarpedon's speech to Glaukos is introduced by the phrase "he named his dear *hetairos*" (φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον).

Trojan hero who tries to save his *hetairoi* from Patroclus but quickly runs in fear, on the one hand, and a Lykian hero who tries to save his *hetairoi* from Patroclus and dies in the attempt. While the Trojan prince must remain alive to fend off the invaders trying to sack his city, the allied commander fighting far from home can perhaps better afford to give his life for his warrior-companions.⁷¹

2.4.2.2 Three rebukes for failing to protect *hetairoi*

2.4.2.2.1 Rebuke for failing to protect *hetairoi* I: Sarpedon regarding Aeneas

Homer chooses a foil for Hector with respect to *hetaireia* carefully. Sarpedon and Glaukos constitute the best example of hero and *hetairos*, more closely bonded than any hero and *hetairos* except Achilles and Patroclus.⁷² Both Lykian heroes rebuke Hector for failing to protect his *hetairoi*.⁷³

Sarpedon's rebuke in Book 5 critiques Hector as both warrior and leader. As in Book 16, the Trojan situation in Book 5 is dire. Like Patroclus in Book 16, Diomedes in his *aristeia* is invincible. With Athena's help, he has just wounded Aphrodite, and Apollo has threatened him with divine *menis* (*Iliad* 5.440-444). Still Diomedes threatens the wounded Aeneas, and Apollo asks Ares to drive the over-reaching human away. Ares responds with a speech to the Trojan leaders, appealing to the fact that Aeneas is their *hetairos* (σαώσομεν ἐσθλὸν ἑταῖρον), in a

⁷¹ Sarpedon is of course deeply aware of his obligations to Lykia – indeed, he fights at Troy because of the way the Lykians treat him at home (*Iliad* 12.310-328).

⁷² Sarpedon and Glaukos are the most closely bonded of the typical non-reciprocal instances of the hero-*hetairos* relation, insofar as Glaukos is Sarpedon's *hetairos* but not vice versa, while Achilles and Patroclus are, uniquely, both *hetairoi* of the other.

⁷³ Sarpedon: *Iliad* 5.472-492. Glaukos: 17.149-153.

passage already discussed in Chapter 1. Sarpedon rebukes Hector immediately after Ares' speech ends:

Ἴκτορ πῆ δὴ τοι μένος οἴχεται ὃ πρὶν ἔχεσκες;

...ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ' οἷ περ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν.

...ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις

λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὄρεσσι.

...σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τάδε πάντα μέλιν νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ

ἀρχοὺς λισσομένῳ τηλεκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων

νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν, κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπὴν.

(*Iliad* 5.472, 477, 485-486, 490-492)

Sarpedon's accusation is twofold: Hector is not using the strength he has previously possessed (μένος οἴχεται ὃ πρὶν ἔχεσκες) and he is not doing his job as a commander (οὐδ' ... κελεύεις). Sarpedon's men fight even though they are merely allies (concessive περ: οἷ περ τ' ἐπίκουροι), while Hector, by contrast (ἀτὰρ), does not even command (κελεύεις) the rest of the army to stand and defend the city. Sarpedon finishes the critique with positive advice: in contrast to what he is currently doing (δέ), Hector must (σοὶ δὲ χρὴ) exhort the commanders of the allies to stand and fight. The rebuke is effective: Hector leaps from his chariot, rouses his men, and the Trojan ranks grow stronger (φάλαγγες / καρτεραί: 591-592). In fact Hector is capable as both warrior and

leader, but it takes Sarpedon's push to get him to defend his *hetairos* Aeneas against a rampaging Diomedes.⁷⁴

2.4.2.2.2 Rebuke for failing to protect *hetairoi* II: Glaukos regarding Sarpedon

Glaukos' rebuke in Book 17 similarly critiques Hector as both leader and warrior, but takes a bitter rather than encouraging tone and attacks Hector more deeply for abandoning his *hetairoi*. The scene is the fight for Patroclus' corpse; the prompt is another retreat at Ajax's approach. Hector tries to drag away Patroclus' body, but as Ajax closes in Hector retreats into the ὄμιλος ἐταίρων (17.129).⁷⁵ Glaukos sees Hector withdraw and addresses him angrily (χαλεπῶ μύθῳ):

Ἔκτορ εἶδος ἄριστε μάχης ἄρα πολλὸν ἐδεύεο.

ἦ σ' αὐτῶς κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἔχει φύξηλιν ἐόντα.

φράζεο νῦν ὅπως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ σωΐσης

οἷος σὺν λαοῖς τοῖ Ἰλίοι ἐγγεγάασιν·

οὐ γάρ τις Λυκίων γε μαχησόμενος Δαναοῖσιν

εἴσι περὶ πτόλιος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν

μάρνασθαι δηΐοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι νωλεμέσιν αἰεὶ.

⁷⁴ Donlan 2002, 161-162 discusses this scene as realistic portrayal of the tense, perpetual renegotiation of relationships between allies. For *xenoi* in Hector's army see Mackie 1996, 85-90. For the tension between Hector and the Lykians as possible evidence of an earlier tradition of strife between Trojans and allies see Fenik 1968, 109.

⁷⁵ The phrase used of Hector's retreat (ἄψ ἐς ὄμιλον ἰὼν ἀνεχάζεθ' ἐταίρων) is the only variation on the formula 'ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο' and is discussed above, under "Safety in retreat: the phrase ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο."

πῶς κε σὺ χεῖρονα φῶτα σαώσεας μεθ' ὄμιλον

σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ Σαρπηδὸν' ἅμα ξεῖνον καὶ ἑταῖρον

κάλλιπες Ἀργεῖοισιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι

ὅς τοι πόλλ' ὄφελος γένετο πτόλεϊ τε καὶ αὐτῷ

ζῶδς ἐών· νῦν δ' οὗ οἱ ἀλαλκόμεναι κύνας ἔτλης.

(*Iliad* 17.142-153)

In Glaukos' view, Hector is not what he seems: he is best in appearance but seriously defective in battle (εἶδος ἄριστε μάχης ἄρα πολλὸν ἐδεύεο). His *kleos* belongs to a coward (φύζηλιν). His behavior will leave him alone to defend the city (πόλιν καὶ ἄστν σαώσης / οἶος) because none of the Lykians will fight for the city (οὐ γάρ τις Λυκίων γε μαχησόμενος... εἴσι περὶ πτόλιος). The abstract name Glaukos gives Hector's failure is χάρις, but he has something concrete in mind.⁷⁶

One particular act makes Hector worthy of this rebuke (σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ): Hector abandoned Sarpedon, *xenos* and *hetairos* (Σαρπηδὸν' ἅμα ξεῖνον καὶ ἑταῖρον / κάλλιπες) as spoils for the Argives, even though Sarpedon provided tremendous benefit (πόλλ' ὄφελος) to both Troy and Hector himself (πτόλεϊ τε καὶ αὐτῷ).⁷⁷ Glaukos' contrastive νῦν δ' emphasizes the discrepancy between the life Sarpedon gave for Hector and Troy and the abandonment given him in return.

Now Hector abandons Patroclus' corpse, whose armor the Trojans might trade for Sarpedon's

⁷⁶ For Glaukos' speech as essentially an accusation that Hector's cowardice is a breach of reciprocity signified by χάρις; Martin 1989, 214-215; Cairns 1993, 86-87 and 2003, 43-44; Donlan 2002, 161-162, informed by the general treatment in MacLachlan 1993.

⁷⁷ This is the second time Glaukos rebukes Hector for the same inaction. At *Iliad* 16.538-547, he accuses Hector of abandoning his allies by failing to protect Sarpedon's corpse. Glaukos takes charge of the situation himself, rallying his friends (ἀλλὰ φίλοι πάρστητε) and here, too, inspiring Hector to fight and lead (ἦρχε δ' ἄρ' ἄ σφιν / Ἐκτορ χωόμενος Σαρπηδόνοϋ: 552-553). Donlan 1979, 62 takes Hector's response as a 'cooperative gesture', correctly suggesting that Hector (though angered at Glaukos' charge) partly concedes Glaukos' point.

(160-165) – missing, through his fear of Ajax (166-168), an opportunity to make up for abandoning the Lykian *hetairos* and give him the honor he deserves.⁷⁸ Hector briefly defends himself from Glaukos’ charge, rightly observing that Zeus’ mind is stronger than anything else (176-178), although such an appeal to a universally accepted metaphysical principle might seem unpersuasively apologetic. But like Sarpedon’s rebuke in Book 5 and Glaukos’ in Book 16, Glaukos’ rebuke in Book 17 does drive Hector to lead and to fight.⁷⁹

2.4.2.2.3 Rebuke for failing to protect *hetairoi* III: Apollo regarding Podes

The final rebuke of Hector for failing to protect his *hetairos* is tied to the pathetic semantics of the phrase *pistos hetairos*. As discussed in Chapter 1, the phrase *pistos hetairos* appears in the *Iliad* only in the books surrounding Patroclus’ return and death; every *hetairos* called *pistos*, except one, is called *pistos* in the passage in which he is killed; and every *pistos hetairos* killed, except one, is killed by Hector. This exception is Podes, Hector’s own *pistos hetairos*.

Podes is introduced as Hector’s dear *hetairos* just before he is killed. Inspired by Athena during the fight for Patroclus’ corpse, Menelaus stands firm and casts a spear at the Trojan forces – and suddenly Homer pauses to name his victim:

βῆ δ’ ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ, καὶ ἀκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῷ.

⁷⁸ Moulton 1981 offers an excellent close reading of Glaukos’ rebuke, building on Fenik 1974, 167-169 and accurately observing Glaukos’ focus on Hector’s ingratitude. For Glaukos’ rebuke as characterization of Hector, along lines similar to those outlined here (albeit without focus on *hetaireia*), see Kozak 2012.

⁷⁹ Interestingly, Hector “ran and met up with his *hetairoi*” (θέων δ’ ἐκίχανεν ἑταίρους) to strip Achilles’ armor, a verb-object pairing that does not appear elsewhere in the *Iliad*. This comes immediately after his rousing speech (184-187) to Trojans and Lykian and Dardanian allies, clearly an attempt to address Glaukos’ rebuke (οὐ γάρ τις Λυκίων γε μαχησόμενος) directly.

ἔσκε δ' ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι Ποδῆς υἱὸς Ἡετίωνος

ἄφνειός τ' ἀγαθός τε· **μάλιστα δέ μιν τίεν Ἴεκτωρ**

δήμου, **ἐπεὶ οἱ ἐταῖρος ἔην φίλος εἰλαπιναστής·**

τόν ῥα κατὰ ζωστῆρα βάλε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος.

(*Iliad* 17.574-578)

Podes is wealthy and noble (ἄφνειός τ' ἀγαθός τε), and Hector particularly honors him because he is dear *hetairos* to Hector at the feast (ἐπεὶ οἱ ἐταῖρος ἔην φίλος εἰλαπιναστής). The appositive εἰλαπιναστής is unusual. Scholion 4 uses this passage to contrast the *hetaireia* joining Achilles and Patroclus with the *hetaireia* joining Hector and Podes. The former were joined by shared virtue and noble deeds (ὅτι κοινωνὸς ἀρετῆς καὶ γενναίων ἔργων), while the latter were *hetairoi* rather like Athenian noblemen of the fifth century (ὅτι συνέπαιζεν οὐδ' ὅτι αὐτὸν ἐκολάκευεν οὐδ' ὅτι ἡδὺς συμπότης ἦν), not warrior-companions. The scholiast may be exaggerating: here Podes is of course fighting at Hector's side. But Homer's mention of the feast has poetic effect: the word briefly suggests a peaceful, celebratory scene that contrasts with the present scene of bloody combat.

Apollo chastises Hector for being afraid of Menelaus, but his rebuke is designed to inspire. Taking the form of Phainops, dearest of *xenoi* to Hector (οἱ ἀπάντων / ξείνων φίλτατος ἔσκεν), Apollo tells him that he must avenge his *pistos hetairos* if any of the Achaeans are to fear him:

Ἴεκτορ τίς κέ σ' ἔτ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν ταρβήσειεν;

οἷον δὴ Μενέλαον ὑπέτρεσας, ὃς τὸ πάρος γε

μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής· νῦν δ' οἴχεται οἶος ἀείρας

νεκρὸν ὑπ' ἐκ Τρώων, σὸν δ' ἔκτανε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον

ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι Ποδῆν υἱὸν Ἡετίωνος.

(*Iliad* 17.586-590)

Menelaus is a weak spearman (μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής), but he has killed Hector's *pistos hetairos*, a noble man on the front lines. In Apollo's judgment, Hector has no reason to be afraid. Again the rebuke has its intended effect, mild as it is. Hector fights amid the *promakhoi* (βῆ δὲ διὰ προμάχων κεκορυθμένος αἶθοπι χαλκῷ: 592) and Zeus turns the tide of battle. The death of this *pistos hetairos* will not go unavenged.

But the effect of Hector's *hetairos*-avenging counterattack is not what he intended. As the Trojans begin to overwhelm the Achaean forces, Ajax recognizes Zeus' fingerprint in the perfect accuracy of Trojan spears and seeks "some *hetairos*"⁸⁰ to tell Achilles that his dear *hetairos* is dead, in a passage dense with *hetaireia*:

ἀλλ' ἄγετ' αὐτοῖ περ φραζώμεθα μῆτιν ἀρίστην,

ἡμὲν ὅπως τὸν νεκρὸν ἐρύσσομεν, ἡδὲ καὶ αὐτοῖ

χάρμα φίλοις ἐτάροισι γενώμεθα νοστήσαντες,

οἳ που δεῦρ' ὀρόωντες ἀκηχέδατ', οὐδ' ἔτι φασὶν

⁸⁰ This is the only appearance of τις ἑταῖρος in the *Iliad* (in any grammatical case). The phrase appears twice in the *Odyssey*: 8.584 (Athena, as Odysseus feels her support when she praises his throw on Scheria) and 16.8 (Odysseus speaking about Telemachus, inferring that he must be *hetairos* or *gnorimos* because the dogs didn't attack). The indefiniteness suggests both Ajax's desperation ('somebody tell him!') and also the fog of war (Ajax says this immediately before Zeus clears the skies).

Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο μένος καὶ χεῖρας ἀάπτους

σχήσεσθ', ἀλλ' ἐν νηυσὶ μελαίνησιν πεσέεσθαι.

εἷη δ' ὅς τις ἑταῖρος ἀπαγγεῖλειε τάχιστα

Πηλεΐδῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐ μιν ὄϊομαι οὐδὲ πεπύσθαι

λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης, ὅτι οἱ φίλος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος.

(*Iliad* 17.634-642)

In a passage about the fight for the corpse of the dearest dead *hetairos*, Ajax names *hetairoi* three times in seven lines: those whom he wishes to bring χάρμα by returning the corpse (χάρμα φίλοις ἐτάροις); the ally who will bring them salvation by telling Achilles of Patroclus' death (τις ἑταῖρος ἀπαγγεῖλειε τάχιστα / Πηλεΐδῃ); and the dear *hetairos* Patroclus himself, whose death will return Achilles to battle (ὅτι οἱ φίλος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος). When Ajax prays for visibility, Zeus clears the skies (645-647); Ajax tells Menelaus to find someone to tell Achilles that his dearest *hetairos* by far is dead (εἶπεῖν ὅτι ῥά οἱ πολὺ φίλτατος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος;⁸¹ 655); Menelaus finds Antilokhos encouraging his *hetairoi* (θαρσύνονθ' ἐτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι: 683); and Antilokhos runs to tell Achilles.⁸² Thus the counterattack Apollo inspires by appealing to

⁸¹ This line repeats the phrase ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος, first introduced at *Iliad* 17.411 as precisely what Thetis does not tell Achilles (δὴ τότε γ' οὐ οἱ ἔειπε κακὸν τόσον ὅσον ἐτύχθη / μήτηρ, ὅτι ῥά οἱ πολὺ φίλτατος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος). The phrase appears four times from here until the beginning of book 18 (*Iliad* 17.411, 642, 655; 18.80) and nowhere else. The emphatic bucolic dieresis, combined with the laser-focus concentration in this very short passage, turn the phrase into an obsessing and brutally factual refrain, mimicking Achilles' frame of mind when the thought of his dead *hetairos* blocks any other activity, including eating and drinking (*Iliad* 19.305-308). Homer thus uses the phrase ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος to encode how Achilles will react to the news in the narrative of the message itself, both under erasure (at 411) and as soon as Antilochus begins to transmit the message (655).

⁸² At this moment Antilochos is *hetairos* in two senses, focalized through two subjects: (1) he is an ally near Ajax and Menelaus on the battlefield; and (2) elsewhere Achilles calls him *philos hetairos* (*Iliad* 23.556). Thus his physical position and persistent relationship to both make him an appropriate messenger.

Hector's bond with his *pistos hetairos* indirectly results in Achilles' return to battle and thereby brings together multiple Achaean *hetairoi* as victim, avenger, and recipients of protection.

2.4.2.3 Family over *hetairoi*

As Glaukos and Sarpedon both observe, Hector's primary concern is to defend his city, not his *hetairoi*. His job is to defend all of Troy, but his greatest love extends to his own family, his wife and child in particular. The Achaean siege demands the former; Hector's personality decides the latter. Sometimes his fellow warriors must press him to defend *hetairoi*, but his family is always on his mind, even in battle.⁸³

Hector thus has two primary obligations, causally intertwined but each irreducible to the other. On the one hand, he must defend his home. On the other, he must lead men in battle. The simultaneous interrelation and tension between the two obligations is famously concentrated in the conversation between Hector and Andromache in Book 6 and vividly captured by Astyanax's reaction to Hector's helmet.⁸⁴ Hector wants to be with his wife, but he must be a warrior; and while Andromache understands the military need enough to offer Hector tactical advice, Astyanax can only shy in terror from Hector's arms.

⁸³ Bowra 1930, 200 calls Hector "less of a soldier than Achilles" insofar as much of Hector's nobility appears off the battlefield in his bond with city and family. Insofar as *hetaireia* is precisely the relation between warriors on the battlefield, "less of a soldier" captures Hector's comparatively weak bond with *hetairoi*. Redfield 1975 takes note of Hector's errors but does not recognize the role of *hetaireia* in his downfall. Cf. also Mueller 1978, which relates Hector's thought that he could possibly face Achilles (when he really knows that he cannot) to other cases of self-delusion, especially by Hector. Moulton 1981, 8 describes a "pattern of inadequacy for the Trojan hero [Hector]." Van Wees (1988, 6) rightly observes that "it is unusual for warriors to *fail* to give mutual support" but does not single out Hector.

⁸⁴ On this scene the best essay is still Schadewaldt 1959, 207-209, which correctly identifies Hector's feelings toward the troops as fear and concern, as opposed to the tenderness he feels toward wife and child. But it is possible to feel tenderness toward warrior-*hetairoi* as well, without necessarily implying a general ethic that prefers force to preservation (as in Bessaloff 1947, 43-49). For Hector's tenderness as feminization see Nortwick 2001.

Hector and Andromache do not mention *hetairoi*. Hector does speak of himself in battle, but describes his warrior-companions as the “first” Trojans, not the more intimate *hetairoi*. He is motivated mainly by αἰδώς from the citizens and by winning glory for himself and his father:

ἦ καὶ ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα μέλει γύναι· ἀλλὰ μάλ’ αἰνῶς

αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους,

αἶ κε κακὸς ὧς νόσφιν ἀλυσκάζω πολέμοιο·

οὐδέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, ἐπεὶ μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλὸς

αἰεὶ καὶ πρότοισι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι

ἀρνύμενος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος ἡδ’ ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ.

(*Iliad* 6.441-446)

Hector’s speech emphasizes the tension between his two obligations (adversative ἀλλά) but also shows which of the two is primary. His *thumos* will not permit him to show cowardice in the eyes of the Trojan men and women because it has “learned” (μάθον) to be noble and to fight with the best Trojan warriors (μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλὸς / αἰεὶ καὶ πρότοισι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι). The αἰδώς from the Trojans, along with the education of his *thumos*, have made him a warrior.

A few lines later Hector explains what truly motivates him to fight. He explicitly contrasts the lesser grief he feels for warriors dying in battle with the greater sorrow he feels for his wife, imagined as a slave after the city is taken:

ἀλλ’ οὐ μοι Τρώων τόσσον μέλει ἄλγος ὀπίσσω,

οὔτ’ αὐτῆς Ἑκάβης οὔτε Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος

οὔτε κασιγνήτων, οἳ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ

ἐν κονίῃσι πέσοιεν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,

ὅσσον σεῦ, ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων

δακρύνεσσαν ἄγεται ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας·

(*Iliad* 6.450-455)

These lines form a priamel wherein a progression of intimates whose future sufferings matter less to Hector are set against the greater suffering of Andromache.⁸⁵ Father, mother, and brothers are named and negated by line-initial οὔτε. Even when Hector describes his care for fellow warriors who die in battle (οἳ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ / ἐν κονίῃσι πέσοιεν), he includes only those that are also part of his family (κασιγνήτων). But none of these, not even his warrior-brothers, concern him as much as his wife (τόσσον μέλει...ὅσσον σεῦ). In sharp contrast with Achilles in Books 18-24, Hector's lament is reserved for family, not *hetairoi*.⁸⁶

2.4.2.3.1 Brother above warrior-companions: abandoning two *hetairoi*, saving Kebriones

In general terms, Hector's care for Andromache and Astyanax is in tension with his responsibilities as warrior and commander. But no matter where his primary sympathy lies, he

⁸⁵ Race 1982, 35 discusses this passage as an example of a priamel whose final term is magnified by the importance of the previous terms.

⁸⁶ Hector's list parallels Phoenix's list, during the embassy to Achilles, of individuals trying to persuade Meleager to join the battle (*Iliad* 9.584-585, 590-591). Phoenix follows the same rank-ordering of affections as Hector – except that Phoenix adds *hetairoi* just before the climax of the priamel. In *Iliad* 22, Athena, disguised as Deiphobus, also includes *hetairoi* in her similarly ranked list of suppliants supposedly trying to persuade him *not* to fight (ἦθεῖ' ἢ μὲν πολλὰ πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ / λίσσονθ' ἐξείης γυνούμενοι, ἀμφὶ δ' ἐταῖροι: *Iliad* 22.239-240). For this rank-ordering as norm see Nagy 1979, 104-106, following Kakridis 1949, 21-24, and contra Lohmann 1970, 258-259. Crotty 1994, 51n9 notices the similarity between the Hector's and Phoenix's speeches but does not make anything of the absence of *hetairoi* from Hector's list.

need not choose between the two in practice. Only success in battle will keep his family safe, although this does not lessen Andromache's suffering or Astyanax's fear.

On the battlefield, however, Hector is surrounded by many warriors, some of whom are also family. The warrior-companions he mentions to Andromache are also his brothers, as noted above. But in combat, too, he prefers to defend warrior-brothers rather than warrior-*hetairoi*. A tightly composed sequence of events in Book 8, recalled at a key moment in Patroclus' *aristeia*, illustrates how differently Hector treats family and *hetairoi* in battle.⁸⁷

Twice in Book 8 Hector leaves a dead charioteer-*hetairos* lying on the battlefield; but the third charioteer, his half-brother Kebriones, he defends against Achaean attack. As Book 8 begins, Zeus has decided to give the Trojans victory. Hector bears down on Nestor, the only Achaean who is not running from Zeus' thunderbolt in terror. Nestor cannot cut his injured horse free; Diomedes sees the danger and picks Nestor up in his chariot. Joining forces, Diomedes as spearman and Nestor as charioteer, the two warriors turn on Hector. Diomedes launches his spear at Hector but strikes his charioteer Eniopes, wounding him fatally in the chest. Hector grieves but lets his dead *hetairos* lie where he fell:

τοῦ δ' ἰθὺς μεμαῶτος ἀκόντισε Τυδέος υἱός·

... τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχὴ τε μένος τε.

Ἴκτορα δ' αἰνὸν ἄχος πύκασε φρένας ἡνιόχοιο·

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' εἶασε καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταίρου

⁸⁷ For the strength of kinship obligations on the Trojan side, see Donlan 2002, 157n4.

κεῖσθαι, ὃ δ' ἡνίοχον μέθεπε θρασύν...

(*Iliad* 8.118- 126)

Terrible grief grips Hector, but he lets Eniopes lie (εἶασε...κεῖσθαι), even though he grieves for his dead *hetairos* (καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταίρου) – just as he will let Sarpedon's body lie, grieved though he is, in Book 16.⁸⁸

Hector abandons another dead charioteer-*hetairos* after two hundred lines. Despite his sorrow for Eniopes' death, Hector acts efficiently. He commands Archeptolemos to replace Eniopes as charioteer and together they pursue Nestor and Diomedes toward the Achaean camp. But again the Achaeans counterattack successfully. This time Teucer kills Archeptolemos, again aiming at and missing Hector (*Iliad* 8.310). And again Hector abandons Archeptolemos, leaving his corpse and grieving for his *hetairos* in the same phrase (εἶασε καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταίρου: 317).

Hector's third charioteer faces the same fate as the first two, but this time Hector intervenes. Teucer is drawing another arrow from his quiver and fitting it to the bow-string, aiming for Hector (322-324). Before Teucer can release the arrow (τὸν δ' αὖ κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ: 324), Hector injures him with a jagged rock, thus keeping both himself and his charioteer safe (322-329). This third charioteer, however, is related to Hector differently from the first two. Kebriones is introduced as Hector's brother immediately after Hector grieves for and abandons Archeptolemos the *hetairos*:

⁸⁸ Elsewhere in this scene Hector's mind is on his immediate family. Sixty lines later Eniopes dies, Hector spurs on his horses with the boast is that he is husband to their former mistress Andromache (οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὖχομαι εἶναι: *Iliad* 8.190).

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' εἶασε καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἑταίρου,

Κεβριόνην δ' ἐκέλευσεν ἀδελφεὸν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα

ἵππων ἥνι' ἐλεῖν· ὃ δ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας.

(*Iliad* 8.317-319)

Kebriones appears without a break after Hector lets Archeptolemos lie (εἶασε) – the brother marked by δέ contrasted with the *hetairos* marked by μέν. The charioteer-brother receives the protection both charioteer-*hetairoi* do not. Hector cares for all three, insofar as he grieves for the deaths of both *hetairoi*; but his feelings do not lead to action when only the corpse of the *hetairos* is at stake.⁸⁹

Hector's attachment to Kebriones affects the plot of the *Iliad* profoundly. In Book 16, after Patroclus kills Kebriones, Hector kills Patroclus during the fight for Kebriones' corpse. Homer's miniature obituary of Kebriones emphasizes his kinship with Hector:

...βάλε δ' Ἕκτορος ἥνιοχῆα

Κεβριόνην νόθον υἱὸν ἀγακλῆος Πριάμοιο

(*Iliad* 16.736-737)

⁸⁹ The presence of Ajax and Teucer calls attention to the bond between Hector and his brother. Ajax and Teucer are only one of many pairs of brothers in the *Iliad* (see Trypanis 1963), but their bond is the closest: together they are often signified by the dual αἶαντε (for bibliography beginning with Wackernagel see Edgeworth and Mayrhofer 1987, finding a parallel in the Mahabharata; most recently Nappi 2002), and Teucer's rescue at 8.330-334 is unusually pathetic (Neal 2006, 99). Cf. also Hector's response to his cousin's death at *Iliad* 15.422-423: Ἕκτωρ δ' ὥς ἐνόησεν ἀνεψιὸν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / ἐν κονίησι πεσόντα νεὸς προπάρειθε μελαίνης, / Τρῳσὶ τε καὶ Λυκίοισιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὔσας.

Kebriones is a *nothos*, merely a bastard half-brother, but Hector's response is swift (Ἔκτωρ δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀφ' ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε: *Iliad* 16.755) and the battle begins immediately around the body:

ὦς **περὶ Κεβριόναο** δύο μήστωρες αὐτῆς

Πάτροκλός τε Μενoitιάδης καὶ φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ...

(*Iliad* 16.759-760)

The two fight around Kebriones (περὶ Κεβριόναο) but also about him: in Homer the genitive with περὶ often indicates what something is being done for.⁹⁰ The killing of Hector's brother-charioteer is the beginning of Patroclus' end. Apollo strips Patroclus, Euphorbus wounds Patroclus, and Hector kills Patroclus during the fight for the corpse of the first non-*hetairos* to serve as Hector's charioteer, the half-brother he saved from Teucer after abandoning two dead charioteer-*hetairoi*.

2.4.2.3.2 Death by ignoring the prudent *hetairos*: Hector and Poulydamas

For most of the *Iliad*, Hector's choice of family over *hetairoi* keeps the city safe, even though Trojan and allied *hetairoi* suffer for Hector's preference. But when Hector dies at Achilles' hands, city and family are both effectively doomed; and his foolish decision to fight Achilles comes from ignoring the advice of a wiser *hetairos*. The persuasion of a *hetairos* is

⁹⁰ LSJ s.v. lists many parallel examples, including Patroclus (δηϊόων περὶ Πατρόκλοιо θανόντος: 18.195) and the city itself (περὶ πτόλιός τε μαχίσεται: 265).

effective (ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφασις ἐστὶν ἐταίρου), but Hector's *hetairos* Poulydamas cannot persuade him not to face Achilles.⁹¹

The advice Hector ignores comes from an obviously wiser *hetairos*. Poulydamas offers Hector tactical advice in three places,⁹² but he is first called *hetairos* when he advises Hector to withdraw the army behind the city walls before Achilles' attack:

τοῖσι δὲ Πουλυδάμας πεπνυμένος ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν

Πανθοΐδης· ὁ γὰρ οἷος ὄρα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω·

Ἔκτορι δ' ἦεν ἐταῖρος, ἣν δ' ἐν νυκτὶ γένοντο,

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἄρ' μύθοισιν, ὁ δ' ἔγχεϊ πολλὸν ἐνίκᾳ·

ὅ σφιν εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν.

(*Iliad* 18.249-252)

Poulydamas' link to Hector is specified with unusual directness (Ἔκτορι δ' ἦεν ἐταῖρος).⁹³ Each warrior has his own strength: Poulydamas is better at speech, while Hector is better at the spear (ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἄρ' μύθοισιν, ὁ δ' ἔγχεϊ πολλὸν ἐνίκᾳ). Homer calls him "prudent" (εὐφρονέων) as he speaks, and his advice – to withdraw within the city walls, which even Achilles cannot penetrate – is clearly correct. But Hector rejects the advice angrily (284: ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν; 295: νήπιε) and rouses the Trojans to ignore Poulydamas. The poet judges the approving crowd harshly (νήπιοι:

⁹¹ Nestor speaks this gnomic phrase to Patroclus at *Iliad* 11.793, and Patroclus repeats it at 15.404. Nestor's purpose is to encourage Patroclus to try to persuade Achilles to let him enter battle. Between Achilles and Patroclus, the saying is true. It is not true between Hector and Poulydamas.

⁹² *Iliad* 12.210-229 (ignored); 13.725-747 (accepted); 18.249-283 (rejected).

⁹³ Scholion 1 cites parrhesia among *hetairoi* to explain why Poulydamas is called *hetairos* in this passage (<Ἔκτορι δ' ἦεν ἐταῖρος;> διὸ παρρησιάζεται αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῷ).

311, echoing Hector's slur of Poulydamas) and openly declares Poulydamas' counsel correct (Πουλυδάμαντι δ' ἄρ' οὐ τις ὅς ἐσθλήν φράζετο βουλήν: 313).⁹⁴

Eventually Hector agrees that his *hetairos* was right. Just before Achilles attacks, as Hector realizes that he has no chance against the *hetairos*-avenger, Hector regrets ignoring Poulydamas' good advice:

Πουλυδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἐλεγχείην ἀναθήσει,

ὅς μ' ἐκέλευε Τρωσὶ ποτὶ πτόλιν ἡγήσασθαι

νύχθ' ὑπο τήνδ' ὅλοῃν ὅτε τ' ὤρετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην· ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν.

νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν,

αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους,

μή ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο·

Ἔκτωρ ἦφι βίῃφι πιθήσας ὤλεσε λαόν.

(*Iliad* 22.100-107)

Poulydamas will blame Hector first, if Hector retreats now – not because the *hetairos* was proved correct, but rather because by his own foolishness Hector destroyed the army (ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν).⁹⁵ Hector would be ashamed (αἰδέομαι) in front of all the Trojans; even an

⁹⁴ For the general persuasiveness of good advice (βουλή) in the *Iliad* see Schofield 1986.

⁹⁵ For the meaning of *atasthalia* see discussion in Chapter 4, under “Cosmic justice and Odysseus’ *nostos*: Athena-*hetairos*’ twofold mission.”

inferior (κακώτερος) would blame him for the destruction of the army, and rightly so. The repetition of ὤλεσα/ε λαόν implies that Hector would agree even with the inferior accuser. Hector presents his error as a mislocation of trust (*peith-/pist-*): he did not obey/was not persuaded by Poulydamas (ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην), but instead foolishly trusted his own strength (ἧφι βίηφι πιθήσας), an accusation he makes more bitter by locating it in the mouth of a lesser man. Too late Hector learns that the wiser *hetairos* deserves more trust than his own physical force.

2.5 Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons

With respect to *hetaireia*, Agamemnon and Hector serve as foils for Achilles. Whereas Agamemnon misunderstands *hetaireia*, has no intimate *hetairos*, and neither depends on nor supports *hetairoi* in battle, Achilles knows how his *hetairoi* feel, enters battle only to avenge his dear *hetairos* Patroclus, and leads a cohesive group of Myrmidon *hetairoi* in the field. Whereas Hector cares primarily about family, especially his wife and child, ignores the advice of his wiser *hetairos*, and abandons the corpses of *hetairoi* in battle, Achilles cares primarily for his *hetairos* Patroclus, more readily than wisely grants Patroclus' wish to enter battle, and fills all of Book 23 with a spectacular funeral for his dead *hetairos*.

The uniqueness of Achilles' and Patroclus' one-to-one *hetaireia* can be summed up in one fact: only Achilles and Patroclus are each *hetairos* to the other.⁹⁶ The uniqueness of Achilles' and Patroclus' one-to-many *hetaireia* with the Myrmidons can be summed up in another: only the Myrmidons persist as a unit outside of battle.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Patroclus *hetairos* to Achilles: 9.220; 11.602; 15.64; 16.195, 240; 17.204, 411, 472, 557, 642, 655; 18.80, 98, 234, 317, 460; 19.345; 20.29, 426; 21.96; 22.390; 23.18, 137, 152, 178, 224, 252, 646, 748; 24.6, 51, 416, 491, 591, 755. Achilles *hetairos* to Patroclus: 1.345; 9.205; 11.616. Uniqueness: see Chapter 1, note 81 (*contra* Stagakis 1966).

⁹⁷ *Contra* van Wees 1986, 291 ("the Myrmidon contingent provides the most explicit example" of large, persistent units with levels of command structure). No other unit persists in the *Iliad* or has clear levels of command structure.

2.5.1 *Hetaireia* in the mustering of the Myrmidons

Only the Myrmidon contingent is described as composed of *hetairoi*. The Catalogue of Ships and the Catalogue of Trojans and Allies in Book 2 are supposed to be exhaustive but call nobody *hetairoi*, as discussed above. But the Catalogue in Book 16 does call the Myrmidons *hetairoi*:

Πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν νῆες θοαί, ἦσιν Ἀχιλλεὺς

ἐς Τροίην ἡγεῖτο Διὶ φίλος· ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη

πεντήκοντ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες ἐπὶ κληῖσιν ἑταῖροι·

πέντε δ' ἄρ' ἡγεμόνας ποιήσατο τοῖς ἐπεποίθει

σημαίνειν· αὐτὸς δὲ μέγα κρατέων ἦνασσε.

(*Iliad* 16.168-172)

The Myrmidon force is composed of fifty ships, and each ship is manned by fifty *hetairoi*. The Myrmidons have more military structure than other groups: Achilles himself commands the force mightily (μέγα κρατέων ἦνασσε), but in the same sentence he trusts (ἐπεποίθει) commanders (ἡγεμόνας) among his *hetairoi*.⁹⁸ Other hero Myrmidons each command a στίξ (τῆς μὲν ἰῆς

Of course, like the other contingents, the Myrmidons did not pre-exist the expedition. Rather, the Myrmidons who came with Achilles were selected one son from each family by lot (*Iliad* 24.397-400).

⁹⁸ Janko 1995, 340 (with generalization in Donlan 2002, 170) reads this passage as emphasizing Achilles' authority over the Myrmidons, conceiving Achilles as 'the one' and the Myrmidons as 'the many'. But these lines show only that the Myrmidons do as he wishes, and 'one-and-many' is simply how *hetaireia* with plural *hetairoi* is normally depicted, given that the central hero is physically much stronger than any of the *hetairoi*. But *Iliad* 16.203-206 makes Achilles' sensitivity to his men's desires clear; and if Achilles' commands respond to the Myrmidons' wishes, then there is no material distinction between doing what Achilles wants them to do and doing what they themselves want to do.

στιχὸς ἦρχε), but these latter divisions are not composed of *hetairoi*.⁹⁹ Because each στίξ must be composed of some of the fifty *hetairoi* who man the fifty ships, the term *hetairoi* cannot designate a formal group, even among the Myrmidons.¹⁰⁰

2.5.2 Achilles' obligation to the “unwilling” Myrmidon *hetairoi*

Achilles is the only commander to acknowledge an obligation to his *hetairoi*. As he prepares to send Patroclus into battle, Achilles imagines¹⁰¹ a Myrmidon berating him for restraining *hetairoi* against their will:

σχέτλιε Πηλέος υἱὲ χόλῳ ἄρα σ' ἔτρεφε μήτηρ,

νηλεές, ὃς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἔχεις ἀέκοντας ἑταίρους·

οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα ποντοπόροισιν

αὔτις, ἐπεὶ ρά τοι ὧδε κακὸς χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ.

⁹⁹ στίξ sometimes refers to sections of an army, especially in the phrase κατὰ στίχας, as at *Iliad* 16.173 (τῆς μὲν ἰῆς στιχὸς ἦρχε Μενέσθιος) and 20.362 (στιχὸς εἶμι διαμπερές); cf. Singor 1991. But no στίξ ever persists beyond a particular passage. Three usages that do not refer to battle order reveal the meaning a little more clearly. The term is used of dancers in Book 18 (ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ θρέξασκον ἐπὶ στίχας ἀλλήλοισι: 18.602). In Book 3, both armies “sit down *kata stikhas*” (ἵζοντο κατὰ στίχας: 3.326) in preparation for Paris' and Menelaus' duel. In Book 5, Hector “sees *kata stikhas*” the slaughter caused by Antilochos and Menelaus (Ἐκτῶρ ἐνόησε κατὰ στίχας: 5.590); this must mean something like “through the ranks,” as also at 11.91 and 16.820, and possibly also 20.326 (where the *stikhes* are again something a hero passes by). Given this wide semantic range, it seems best to take Homeric στίξ in connection with the verb στείχω, ‘step’ or ‘step together’ (cf. Latacz 1977, 60-62), which captures both dancing and marching, on the one hand, and also suggests a movable threshold through or over which movement can occur, on the other. (Other IE cognates include words for mountain-climbing (German *Steig*), ascent in general (Dutch *stijgen*), the stirrup, and (as in Greek) verse-parts and elements of nature – only the latter two of which have any of the mechanical sense of battle order, and even in these two cases the order is metaphorical.)

¹⁰⁰ For bibliography on the Catalogue of Myrmidons see Janko 1992, 339-342 and Sammons 2010, 159n84; for mythical background of each named Myrmidon commander see Hofmeister 1995, 304-307.

¹⁰¹ For Achilles' particular mastery over hypothetical images see Friedrich and Redfield 1978, 273. For Achilles' famous eloquence in general see Parry 1956 (Achilles expresses more than the oral-formulaic style can express), with critique in Reeve 1973 and Claus 1975. Achilles' personality revealed through his speech: Friedrich and Redfield 1978 *passim* (although see technical objections in Messing 1981); Martin 1989, chapter 4; Mackie 1996, chapter 4.

(*Iliad* 16.203-206)

The imagined Myrmidon insults Achilles twice line-initially (σχέτλιε, νηλεές). He explains the insult: Achilles has “constrained his unwilling *hetairoi*” next to the ships (παρὰ νηυσὶν ἔχεις ἀέκοντας ἐταίρους). This constraint has everything to do with Achilles’ *kholos* and nothing to do with his *hetairoi*.¹⁰² But unlike Agamemnon’s troops in Book 2, the Myrmidons want most of all to fight. Unlike Agamemnon himself, Achilles listens to his men: he concedes the imagined Myrmidon’s point and sends his *hetairoi* into battle.

Achilles’ speech not only rouses the Myrmidons but also increases their cohesion. The Myrmidons gather closer together when they hear their king (μᾶλλον δὲ στίχες ἄρθεν, ἐπεὶ βασιλῆος ἄκουσαν: *Iliad* 16.211). They receive killing power both as individuals and as a group when Achilles corrects the wrong he did to his “unwilling *hetairoi*.”¹⁰³

2.5.3 Achilles and Patroclus leading the Myrmidons

The bond between Achilles and Patroclus overflows into their relation to the Myrmidon *hetairoi*. The Myrmidons follow Patroclus as if he were Achilles. Achilles gives Patroclus command by sending him as *hetairos* among the Myrmidons, and Patroclus accepts command by addressing the Myrmidons as Achilles’ *hetairoi*.

¹⁰² Achilles understands and appreciates the feelings of the Myrmidon *hetairoi*, while Agamemnon catastrophically misunderstands the feelings of the army (not called *hetairoi*) in Book 2 (cf. Janko 1992, 345). But even the Myrmidons’ unwillingness not to fight is a case of fellow feeling with Achilles, since Achilles also longs to fight even at the peak of his anger against Agamemnon: ἀλλὰ φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ / αὖθι μένων, ποθέεσκε δ’ αὖτῃν τε πτόλεμόν τε (*Iliad* 1.491-492). In this way the Myrmidons are giving Achilles what he wants (albeit *in persona Patrocli*) precisely insofar as he is giving them what they want.

¹⁰³ The wrong Achilles committed against the Myrmidons is magnified in the surviving fragments of Aeschylus’ *Myrmidons*, where the Myrmidons berate Achilles twice for not fighting (fr. 131, 132) and possibly threaten to stone him for treachery (132c).

In Achilles' words, Patroclus-*qua*-commander is not his ritual substitute (*therapon*) but rather his *hetairos*; and the men he commands are close-fighting *hetairoi*.¹⁰⁴ The transfer of command occurs formally during Achilles' prayer to Zeus, described as a sending and returning of the *hetairos* with the Myrmidons:¹⁰⁵

αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ μενέω νηῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι,

ἀλλ' ἔταρον πέμπω πολέσιν μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι...

ἀσκηθῆς μοι ἔπειτα θοᾶς ἐπὶ νῆας ἵκοιτο

τεύχεσί τε ζὺν πᾶσι καὶ ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν.

(*Iliad* 16.239, 247-248)

The *hetairos* will go and return with (μετά, ζύν) the Myrmidon army (πολέσιν, πᾶσι), themselves *hetairoi* (ἐτάροισιν). The group is tight-knit: the *hetairoi* fight close together (ἀγχεμάχοις), a term that refers to the Myrmidons in three out of its four appearances.¹⁰⁶ No other speech in the *Iliad* indicates transfer of leadership: the sending of the *hetairos* with many *hetairoi* is sufficient to signify that Patroclus will lead the Myrmidons in battle.

Patroclus accepts command within this same framework of *hetaireia*. He opens his pre-battle speech by addressing the "Myrmidon *hetairoi* of Achilles":

¹⁰⁴ For *therapon* as ritual substitute see van Brock 1959; Nagy 1979, chapter 6, esp. 292-293; 1990, 129-131; Sinos 1980; Lowenstam 1981, 126-131; Nortwick 1992, 39-88; Muellner 1996, 155-168; Konstan 1997, 42.

¹⁰⁵ For a sensitive reading of Achilles' prayer in the context of Patroclus' death see Hofmeister 1995.

¹⁰⁶ Myrmidon ἀγχεμάχοι: 16.148, 272; 17.165. The fourth instance of ἀγχεμάχος refers to the Mysian horsemen to whom Zeus turns his attention when he thinks that the rest of the gods will no longer enter battle (13.5). LSJ defines the word as 'fighting hand to hand', which must be its meaning in later texts (e.g. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.4.15.7) but this seems an unlikely way to describe mounted (i.e. Mysian) combat.

Πάτροκλος δ' ἐτάροισιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὖσας·

Μυρμιδόνες ἔταροι Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος

άνερες ἔστε φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς,

ὥς ἂν Πηλεΐδην τιμήσομεν, ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος

Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ καὶ ἀγχιμάχοι θεράποντες,

γυνῶ δὲ καὶ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

ἦν ἄτην, ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισεν.

(*Iliad* 16.269-274)

The speech is addressed to Patroclus' *hetairoi* in the narrative (ἐτάροισιν ἐκέκλετο) and opens with an appeal to Achilles' *hetairoi* (Μυρμιδόνες ἔταροι Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος). At the moment Patroclus takes command, the Myrmidons are *hetairoi* to both Achilles and Patroclus. The solidarity implied by this repetition is reflected by details of Patroclus' expression. Patroclus begins with two second-person verbs (ἔστε, μνήσασθε), but quickly switches to the first-person plural (τιμήσομεν). The auditors are a 'you' as *hetairoi* to Achilles; but then they are a 'we' in honoring Achilles.¹⁰⁷ Patroclus calls them near-fighting retainers (ἀγχιμάχοι θεράποντες), echoing Achilles' description of the Myrmidons as near-fighting *hetairoi* (ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν: 248). Patroclus twice mentions the Myrmidons' bond with Achilles (ἔταροι, θεράποντες) and Achilles' excellence (ἄριστος Ἀργείων; ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν). The speech contains little else; the only motivator is the bond that Patroclus and the Myrmidons share with one another and with

¹⁰⁷ For the importance of a sense of 'we' in military units see Chapter 5, under "Military psychology: *hetaireia* and the primary group."

Achilles. The appeal to *hetaireia* is sufficient: the might and courage of each Myrmidon is roused, and the Trojans fear the unit as if Achilles himself were leading it (ἐλπόμενοι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα / μηνιθμόν μὲν ἀπορρῖψαι: 281-282).¹⁰⁸

2.5.4 Myrmidon cohesion and the vocative *hetairoi*

The unique cohesiveness of the Myrmidon unit allows Achilles and Patroclus to address the troops directly as *hetairoi*. No other heroes in the *Iliad* do this. Even so, the use of ἑταῖροι in direct address is extremely rare. Patroclus' speech in Book 16 contains one of only two appearances of *hetairoi* in the vocative. The other occurs in Achilles' second major speech to the Myrmidons, just after Hector is killed.

Just as in Book 16 Achilles unleashes the Myrmidons' bloodlust under the command his *hetairos* and under the obligations of *hetaireia*, so also in book 23 he closes the Myrmidon battle-frenzy by appealing to the obligation of *hetairoi* to lament:

οἳ μὲν ἄρ' ἐσκίδναντο ἐὴν ἐπὶ νῆα ἕκαστος,
Μυρμιδόνας δ' οὐκ εἶα ἀποσκίδνασθαι Ἀχιλλεύς
ἀλλ' ὃ γε οἷς ἐτάροισι φιλοπτολέμοισι μετηύδα·
Μυρμιδόνες ταχύπωλοι ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι
μὴ δὴ πω ὑπ' ὄχεσφι λυώμεθα μώνυχας ἵππους,
ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασιν ἄσσον ἰόντες

¹⁰⁸ *Hetaireia* accounts for Patroclus' and Nestor's idea in the first place: Patroclus was first moved to enter battle by the sound of Danaans dying (*Iliad* 15.395-398). *Hetaireia* also touches off the sequence that leads to his doom: grief for the death of Epeigeus named *hetairos* drives him to charge the Trojans and Lykians during the fight for Sarpedon's corpse (16.581: Πατρόκλῳ δ' ἄρ' ἄχος γένητο φθιμένου ἐτάριοιο), a charge that leads to his death.

Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν· ὃ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.

(*Iliad* 23.3-9)

Achilles and the Myrmidons are joined by their sorrow for Patroclus. As Patroclus addresses his men as “Μυρμιδόνες ἔταροι Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος” before battle, so Achilles addresses the same troops as “Μυρμιδόνες...ἐμοὶ...ἐταῖροι” after Patroclus is avenged. Again like Patroclus, Achilles identifies himself with the Myrmidons by speaking in first-person plural verbs (λῶμεθα, κλαίωμεν). The first verb is a foil for the second: “let us” not let our horses go, but rather “let us” lament Patroclus (enjambéd: Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν). As Patroclus’ solidarity with the Myrmidons is located in the honor they all show Achilles, so Achilles’ solidarity with the Myrmidons is located in their lamentation for Patroclus.

Before Achilles even begins to speak, Homer emphasizes how well the Myrmidons still cohere. While the non-Myrmidons split up (ἐσκίδναντο) and depart to their own tents individually (ἐπὶ νῆα ἕκαστος), the Myrmidons do not scatter and do not go each to their own ship. They remain together under Achilles’ command, for he does not let them disperse (οὐκ εἶα ἀποσκίδνασθαι) until they lament Patroclus together.

But Achilles’ request for lament in Book 23 merely expresses what the Myrmidon *hetairoi* have already done. In Book 19, Thetis returns from Olympus to deliver the new armor she received from Hephaistos, only to find Achilles in mourning with the Myrmidon *hetairoi* around him in tears:

ἦ δ’ ἐς νῆας ἵκανε θεοῦ πάρα δῶρα φέρουσα.

εὔρε δὲ Πατρόκλῳ περικείμενον ὄν φίλον υἱὸν

κλαίοντα λιγέως· πολέες δ' ἄμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι

μύρονθ'...

(*Iliad* 19.3-6)

As in battle, the *hetairoi* are “around” (ἄμφι) the hero. The image is repeated two hundred lines later, but this time the *hetairoi* are “around” (ἄμφι) Patroclus himself:

πρὶν δ' οὗ πῶς ἂν ἔμοιγε φίλον κατὰ λαιμὸν ἰεῖη

οὐ πόσις οὐδὲ βρῶσις ἑταίρου τεθνηῶτος

ὅς μοι ἐνὶ κλισίῃ δεδαῖγμένος ὀξείῃ χαλκῷ

κεῖται ἀνὰ πρόθυρον τετραμμένος, ἄμφι δ' ἑταῖροι

μύρονται.

(*Iliad* 19.209-213)

The repetition of ἄμφι...μύρονται emphasizes how deeply the Myrmidon *hetairoi* are woven into the Achilles-Patroclus relationship. Both Achilles and Patroclus are at the center of Myrmidon lament. Indeed, at this point the Myrmidon *hetairoi* are grieving for Patroclus more than Achilles is, for in the next two lines Achilles explains that murder and blood and screaming have momentarily supplanted lamentation in his *phren* (τό μοι οὐ τι μετὰ φρεσὶ ταῦτα μέμηλεν, / ἀλλὰ φόνος τε καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἀργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν: *Iliad* 19.213-214).¹⁰⁹ While Achilles prepares to

¹⁰⁹ At *Iliad* 1.249, separation from the Myrmidon *hetairoi* signifies Achilles' isolation: before he calls his mother he sits on the shore and “weeps and sits apart from his *hetairoi*” (δακρύσας ἐτάρων ἄφαρ ἔζετο). The phrase ‘ἐτάρων ἄφαρ’, the exact opposite of ‘ἄμφι δ' ἑταῖροι’, appears only here. For Achilles, the feeling that trumps sorrow for a dead *hetairos* is rage. Cf. Shay 1994, chapters 3 (grief) and 5 (berserk rage). For Indo-European parallels see most recently Woodard 2013.

avenge him, the Myrmidons lament the dead *hetairos* that both have failed to protect from Hector.

Conclusions: groups of *hetairoi* and the plot of the *Iliad*

In the *Iliad*, nothing motivates warriors in combat more than *hetaireia*, but *hetaireia* is not a military institution. The ἔθνος ἑταίρων is not a unit of military organization, but rather a group of individual warriors fighting together. Nobody earns ‘*hetairos*’ as an institutional title; rather, warriors are called *hetairoi* when they act as *hetairoi*, that is, when they protect, avenge, and lament their companions in battle. Moreover, *heta(i)r-* signifies action and affection indifferently. Warriors are called *hetairoi* when they are felt as *hetairoi*, joined together as a ‘we’ in violence or lament. The effect of these features of *hetaireia* is that, in the *Iliad*, there is no distance between physical and moral support. Commanders lead well who fight well for their *hetairoi*. The most cohesive unit is led by the only pair of mutual *hetairoi*, and the most effective warrior is also the most emotionally attached to his *hetairoi*. The hero who feels grief for a dead *hetairos*, but does nothing to defend the corpse, is rebuked repeatedly by his most important allies, who twice almost abandon him as a result.

While the Iliadic account of warrior-companionship is consistent with the “face of battle” approach in modern historiography,¹¹⁰ the transmission of *hetaireia* from the *Iliad* to modern war narratives is surprisingly discontinuous, given the domineering influence of Homer on European literature in general. For *hetairoi* after Homer are not warriors; and fifth and fourth century war

¹¹⁰ For ‘face of battle’ work in ancient history see general introduction, with more detailed survey in Wheeler 2011. For the psychological plausibility of Iliadic warriors see Shay 1994; for Iliadic psychology in general the most influential works remain Snell 1948, Dodds 1951, Adkins 1960, and Fränkel 1962 (none of which are now accepted uncritically). For *hetaireia* and ancient psychology see “Conclusions and postscript,” under “History of psychology: *hetaireia* from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*.”

narratives say comparatively little about the experience of warriors in battle, let alone the specific kind of affection and cohesion encoded in the Iliadic concept of *hetaireia*.¹¹¹ By Thucydides' time, war has become the business of the *polis*, not the warrior-band. The society of the *Iliad* is still treated as irretrievably primitive by many social, political, and military historians, even as literary critics and military psychologists are beginning to rediscover the value of the Homeric depiction of the psychology of combat.¹¹²

The post-Iliadic treatment of *hetaireia* is therefore important to historians as well as literary scholars. The rise of state warfare in Greece has been documented extensively, but the role of Homer in the transition, in capacities other than point of departure or partial prototype, has been overlooked. Where Homeric warfare appears in historical work on the rise of the hoplite and the *polis*, the poem treated is usually the *Iliad*, and the *Iliad*'s narrative function is to serve as either seed or foil for the birth of hoplite warfare. Where Homeric society is treated as predecessor of the *polis*, the *Iliad* serves as point of departure ("primitive warrior-society") and the *Odyssey* is treated as foretaste ("the *oikos* is the *polis*").¹¹³

What happens in the *Odyssey* to the warriors of the *Iliad* is narrated explicitly; but what replaces warrior-companionship in the *Odyssey* is not well understood. In particular, the thematic relevance of the destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi* by their own *atasthalia* (*Odyssey* 1.7) to the historical disappearance of warrior-companionship has never been treated in depth. Since the *Odyssey* actually tells how Odysseus' *hetairoi* die, and then tells how Odysseus retakes his

¹¹¹ That is, until Phillip II deliberately revives Homer-like *hetaireia* in fourth-century Macedon. See "Conclusions and postscript," under "Prospective: *hetaireia* and military companionship after Homer."

¹¹² Shay 1994 and 2002 are regularly cited in clinical literature on combat trauma.

¹¹³ For ancient historians on Homer see general introduction; for the transition from the warrior-society of the *Iliad* to the post-military society of the *Odyssey* see Chapter 4.

kingdom with violence but without warrior-companions, it seems clear that the *Odyssey* poet is interested in telling the story of the dissolution of *hetaireia* and its replacement. The next two chapters sound the *Odyssey* for this tale.

CHAPTER 3: DISSOLVING *HETAIREIA* IN THE *ODYSSEY*

Introduction

Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation describe *hetaireia* in terms of how it affects individuals, groups, plot, and characterization in the *Iliad*. Chapters 3 and 4 tell two complementary stories of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey*: first, how it falls apart; and second, what replaces it. Chapter 3 traces the dissolution of *hetaireia* from Odysseus' departure from Troy to his arrival on Scheria. Chapter 4 traces the replacement of *hetaireia* by kin, slaves, and Athena.

The dissolution and replacement of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* differentiates the two Homeric epics by topic, primary objective, motivational and affective structure, and dominant social relationship. The *Iliad* is about war. The *Odyssey* is about returning home from war. The *Iliad* mostly takes place on the battlefield, and the battlefield generates warrior companionship. *Hetairoi* are whichever nearby warriors give and receive support to and from heroes both physically and morally. The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, mostly takes place in ships, on islands, and in a banquet hall; none of these settings generates warrior companionship. The hero reaches home without any *hetairoi* because his *hetairoi* have destroyed themselves by offending the gods. In the *Odyssey*, on the way home from war, Iliadic *hetaireia* falls apart. The proem places the loss of *hetaireia* at the crux of the promised plot: the climax of Odysseus' sufferings is the self-destruction of his *hetairoi* (*Odyssey* 1.5-7).

Heroes and *hetairoi* in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* think, feel and relate to one another differently because the major characters in the two epics seek different goals. Iliadic warriors

fight to destroy or defend a kingdom. Their primary group is the warrior-band because their mission is war.¹ Achilles' dearest companion is a warrior whose death leads to the death of the Trojan kingdom's greatest protector. But the hero of the *Odyssey* struggles first to return to his kingdom, and then to save his kingdom—and the royal household—from the young men who are trying to marry his wife. Odysseus' primary group is the *oikos* insofar as his mission is *nostos*. Crucially, however, Odysseus is also allied with the gods insofar as his mission is justice.² It is no coincidence, therefore, that his human companions on Ithaca are not called *hetairoi*, and that his divine companion most commonly takes the form of his human *hetairos* Mentor.

These differences between what the main characters are trying to accomplish affect the motivational structures in the two epics. *Hetaireia* is motivationally central to the battles on the Trojan plain, but irrelevant, at first, and then dangerous to Odysseus' *nostos*. Iliadic warriors fight mainly for one another, and the climactic event of the plot is the death of the greatest warrior's dearest *hetairos*.³ The Iliadic poet not only avoids emphasizing, but also deliberately questions, the motivational force of the war's mythical *prophasis* and operational objective (the return of Helen) in the eyes of everyone except the Atreidae.⁴ The Iliadic battlefield absorbs

¹ The term 'primary group' can be taken in either informally or in a technical psychoanalytic sense, first influentially applied to military units in Freud 1922[1921] and concretely applied to captured Wehrmacht units in Shils and Janowitz 1948 and generalized from there. The Freudian roots of the concept of the primary group are not always acknowledged in the literature; for a critique see Smith 2002. The Wehrmacht may not be the best example of such a group in any case: see Bartov 1992 and Fritz 1996 for the importance of Nazi ideology to the Wehrmacht in particular, adding to but not rejecting the primary group theory. For *hetaireia* and twentieth century theories of combat motivation, with bibliography, see "Conclusions and postscript," under "Military psychology: *hetaireia* and the primary group."

² For the alignment of Odysseus' *nostos* and Zeus' theodicy see discussion of 'Athena *hetairos*' in Chapter 4, under "Cosmic justice and Odysseus' *nostos*: Athena-*hetairos*' twofold mission."

³ See appendix for tabulation of motivation in Iliadic battle. For bibliographical survey of motivation in Iliadic warfare see general introduction.

⁴ So Achilles claims at *Iliad* 1.152-160. If the oath of Tyndareus (Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 204.77-85) was current at the time of the composition or assembly of the *Iliad*, then Homer's suppression of the oath is even more

every concern into itself; the warriors' horizon of desire extends only to their fellow warriors, living or dead.⁵

In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, specific and remote goals motivate every major character, excluding the *hetairoi* themselves. From the proem and Zeus' theodicy in Book 1, the plot favors protagonists' objectives over others' and sometimes at their expense (the death of the suitors at Odysseus' hands). Odysseus, Telemachus, and Penelope act in order that, and often openly wishing that, Odysseus should return home. The suitors go for the opposite. The fate of the Ithacan royal family is always in everyone's mind in the *Odyssey*, while Helen's destiny after the *Iliad* is rarely in anyone's mind except the Atreidae and Helen herself. Accordingly, the *Iliad* ends not with the achievement of the objective to regain Helen but with the sorrow that follows inevitably from the presence of *hetaireia* in deadly battle, while the *Odyssey* ends not with sorrow at the loss of *hetairoi* (or even sorrow at the loss of local nobility *en masse*) but with the glory of the royal family triumphing in divine justice against unjustified insurrection.⁶ *Hetaireia* fills the motivational and affective space of the *Iliad* but occupies no motivational and affective space by the end of the *Odyssey*.⁷

thorough than his famously problematic near-suppression of the judgment of Paris (for comparison see Walcott 1977, 32-33).

⁵ Achilles' return to battle (after promising to return to Phthia in *Iliad* 9) after Patroclus' death emphasizes the motivational totality of Iliadic war and the dominance of *hetaireia* in battle. The choice between long life away from battle and *kleos* in battle is no longer interesting now that the dearest *hetairos* is dead.

⁶ The *Odyssey* proem already includes the motivational shift from warrior-companions to family: seven lines after Odysseus 'desires' (ἰέμενος; *Odyssey* 1.6) to save his *hetairoi* (which he does not achieve) he 'yearns for' his homecoming and his wife (νόστου κεχρημένον ἥδ' ἑταίρας; 13) (which eventually he does achieve).

⁷ If warrior-companionship is the motivational and affective core of the *Iliad*, then the disappearance of warrior-companionship in the *Odyssey* must be a significant part of the affective differences between the two poems. The climactic event of the *Iliad* is the death of Patroclus the *hetairos* in Book 16, for which the earlier books prepare and which the later books resolve, eventually closing the *Iliad* with lament; while the *Odyssey* opens with the proleptic

Insofar as the *oikos* comes to dominate the social and economic world of the *Odyssey*,⁸ careful study of the dissolution of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey*—and what replaces it, and how this replacement facilitates the rise of the *oikos*—suggests ways of thinking about the post-Iliadic world in which the *oikos* has replaced the warrior-band, and in which the word *hetairos* no longer names a warrior.⁹ As Odysseus loses his *hetairoi*, the relationship that dominates the battle plains of the *Iliad* is replaced by new relationships that better suit the Ithacan banquet hall. The most strikingly non-Iliadic of these relationships is the exclusive and uniquely intimate bond between Odysseus and Athena. It is no coincidence that she is the only individual called *hetairos* to Odysseus after he returns to Ithaca.

Four major movements

The dissolution and subsequent replacement of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* takes place in four major movements.¹⁰ The first two movements describe the breakdown of *hetaireia* and the self-destruction of the *hetairoi*. These are treated in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. The second two movements present the development and final enactment of what replaces mortal *hetaireia* at both human and divine levels. These are treated in Chapter 4.

death of Odysseus' *hetairoi* (by their own *atasthalia*) and closes with victory and exultation unmixed with lament, though Odysseus ends the poem with happiness and with no *hetairoi* at all.

⁸ For the role of the *oikos* in the *Odyssey* see especially Finley 1978 (still the most influential treatment); Lacey 1968; Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977; Qviller 1981; Donlan 1985b, 1989, 1997; Halverson 1986; Scully 1981, 1990 esp. 100-112; Thalmann 1998, 109-238; and most recently Cavalli 2009. For Adkinsian 'competitive' values in the *oikos*, in tension with the "cooperative" values of the future *polis*, see Morris 1986, 115-120; Seaford 1994, with critique in Rose 1997.

⁹ See Chapter 5 ("Conclusions and prospective") for a brief prospective sketch of *hetaireia* and warrior-companionship after the *Odyssey*.

¹⁰ I borrow the term from Sheppard 1922, whose division of the *Iliad* into three "movements" has proved very fruitful.

The first major movement is the breakdown of trust in stages between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*.¹¹ First, immediately after the sack of Troy, Odysseus loses six *hetairoi* from each ship during the initially successful, then immediately disastrous attack on the Cicones.¹² This triggers the first lament for Odysseus' dead *hetairoi*—a motif that will recur at every stage of his return.¹³ Odysseus' excessive curiosity leads these men to die, but for the moment the *hetairoi* do not actually reject his leadership. In the second and third stages, hero and *hetairoi* each make potentially catastrophic decisions against the express wishes of the other, opening a mutual rift that eventually leads to the disaster at Thrinakia. First, Odysseus justifiably loses trust in his *hetairoi* in the land of the Lotus-Eaters; then Odysseus' *hetairoi* justifiably lose trust in Odysseus in the cave of the Cyclops.¹⁴

The *hetairoi* openly express this distrust when they open the bag of the winds in fear that Odysseus is hiding some wealth from them. This is the fourth stage in the dissolution of Iliadic *hetaireia*, and the first time the *hetairoi* actively destroy their own (and delay Odysseus') day of homecoming.¹⁵ The fifth stage confirms the suspicions of the *hetairoi*: at the harbor of the Laestrygonians, Odysseus hangs back with “my *hetairoi*” (ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισιν—i.e., the *hetairoi* on

¹¹ The concept intended by ‘trust’ is more precisely signified by the root *peith/pist*. In the *Iliad*, *pistos* frequently modifies *hetairos* (although always when the *hetairos* is doomed to die: cf. Chapter 1, under “The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*”). I do not mean ‘trust’ in a moral sense, as if someone untrustworthy were morally at fault. Rather, by ‘trustworthy’ I mean simply ‘can be counted on’ – to make wise and prudent, not merely non-selfish, decisions. For a more moralizing take on trust (and distrust) in the *Odyssey* see Rutherford 1986.

¹² *Odyssey* 9.47-61 (number at 60-61: ἐξ δ’ ἀφ’ ἐκάστης νηὸς εὐκνήμιδες ἐταῖροι / ὦλονθ’).

¹³ The same two-line lament for dear dead *hetairoi* (ἐνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ / ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἐταῖρους) appears after the Ciconian incident (*Odyssey* 9.62-63), the escape from the Cyclops' cave (9.565-566), and disaster in the Laestrygonian harbor (10.133-134).

¹⁴ This is unparalleled in the *Iliad*. Agamemnon's warriors do not trust him, and their interests do not align with his – neither Achilles' nor the masses' in Book 2; but these warriors are not Agamemnon's *hetairoi*.

¹⁵ *Odyssey* 10.38-45 (one of the many passages in the *Apologoi* that Odysseus, here asleep, could not actually have witnessed).

his own ship) and leaves the bulk of his *hetairoi* to die in a helpless struggle against gigantic monsters.¹⁶ Finally, Odysseus accepts that his old *hetaireia* is gone. He divides his men into two groups, appointing Eurylochus as *arkhegos*—a position Eurylochus will eventually use to drive all the remaining *hetairoi* to self-destruction on Thrinakia.

The second major movement is the self-destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi*. This happens in three parts; all three follow directly from Odysseus' half-abdication, as he gives Eurylochus command of half the *hetairoi* on Aiaia. The first part is Eurylochus' initial gesture toward mutiny: he restrains the *hetairoi* as Odysseus commands them to leave, observing (accurately) that Odysseus' expeditions sometimes result in disaster.¹⁷ The second part is a total separation between Odysseus and every other *hetairos*: Odysseus speaks to shades in the underworld alone, apart from his *hetairoi*.¹⁸ The third part is the actual self-destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi*, inspired by a speech Eurylochus delivers that begins by quoting Odysseus: a direct address to the "*hetairoi* who have suffered much."¹⁹ Chapter 3 ends with Odysseus alone without *hetairoi*, the promise of the proem fulfilled.

The third major movement contains the replacement of Iliadic *hetaireia* by slaves and kin, on the one hand, and Athena, on the other. First, at the moment Odysseus begins to recover from his depression, he encounters his first *hetairos* since Thrinakia: an anonymous Phaeacian

¹⁶ *Odyssey* 10.128. The phrase "my *hetairoi*" is comparatively rare in Homer (*Iliad* 1.183, 22.272, 23.6; *Odyssey* 9.173, 10.128, 11.78) and always marked. For ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν in the *Iliad* see Chapter 2, under "Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans." For ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν in the *Odyssey* see "The Laestrygonian incident" below.

¹⁷ *Odyssey* 10.429-437, echoing the proem to blame Odysseus for the deaths of many *hetairoi* (10.437: τοῦτου[=Odysseus] γὰρ καὶ κείνοι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο; 1.7: αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο)

¹⁸ For an allied take on Odysseus' role in the sequence of disasters beginning with the Cicones see Shay 2002, 236-241 ("Summary of the Charges against Captain Odysseus").

¹⁹ κέκλυτέ μεν μύθων, κακά περ πάσχοντες ἐταῖροι (*Odyssey* 12.271[Eurylochus]=10.190[Odysseus]).

who warms his heart by complementing his discus throw—and who is actually Athena in disguise.²⁰ She is called *hetairos* when she is felt to be a *hetairos*, insofar as her words support Odysseus in the competition; her moral support brings him self-confidence and joy. Second, a new kind of *hetairos* is introduced, comprising Eumaius’ fellow swineherds, the first and only institutionally non-military *hetairoi* in Homer.²¹ They support Eumaius—but at herding and cooking, not in battle. Third, Odysseus’ physical supporters on Ithaca are introduced before the final battle; but they are family (Telemachus) and slaves (Eumaius, Philoitios) – members of the *oikos*, not aristocratic and military peers – and are never called *hetairoi*.²² Fourth, Telemachus returns with his band of *hetairoi*, including a new *hetairos* named Peisistratus, but the group disbands, and they do not help the house of Odysseus defeat the suitors and their families.²³

The replacement of *hetaireia* culminates in the two final battles. Slaves and relatives give Odysseus the physical support that his *hetairoi* did not; Athena gives him the moral support that his *hetairoi* did not, and that his family and slaves cannot. The suitors, having previously attempted to form a group of *hetairoi* in order to ambush Telemachus, are shown to be neither

²⁰ *Odyssey* 8.193-200 (the first of several times Athena-*hetairos* gives Odysseus joy).

²¹ *Odyssey* 14.407, 460, 462; 15.307, 309, 337. Odysseus’, Menelaus’, Nestor’s, Diomedes’ *hetairoi* are also not fighting when they row; but they are not *institutionally* not warriors, in the sense in which the slave-*hetairoi* of a slave are institutionally barred from military activity.

²² At *Odyssey* 21.213-216, Odysseus promises to make Eumaius and Philoitios *hetairoi* and “brothers” to Telemachus in return for their support in battle (καί μοι ἔπειτα / Τηλεμάχου ἐτάρω τε κασιγνήτω τε ἔσεσθον). This never actually happens in the poem. More importantly, the ability to confer *hetaireia* (as well as kinship) is itself new, unintelligible in Iliadic terms. See discussion under “Eumaius, Philoitios, Dolios and sons: warrior-slaves” in Chapter 4.

²³ *Odyssey* 15.36-39. Athena herself, disguised as Mentor, dissolves the group, as she had gathered it in the first place. Telemachus also keeps his *pistos hetairos* Peiraios (“most trusted of my *hetairoi*”: σὺ δέ μοι τὰ περ ἄλλα μάλιστα / πείθῃ ἐμῶν ἐτάρων) away from battle by asking him to care for Theoclymenos (15.539-544) just before he departs to meet his father in Eumaius’ hut.

warriors nor even loyal companions.²⁴ They are defeated by the pairing of purely physical force, exerted by Odysseus with two family members and two herdsmen (adding another slave, with his sons, against the forces assembled by the suitors' families), with primarily moral force, exerted by Athena (disguised as Odysseus' *hetairos* Mentor). Athena's conversations with Odysseus are primarily morale-boosting, and even her less intramental interventions—the alternating hiding and beautification of Odysseus, Telemachus, and Penelope—pertain to appearance rather than physical reality. In the final battles, the *Odyssey* poet associates Athena's intervention with the specific spatial trajectories of the weapons that she deflects less directly than does the poet of the *Iliad*.²⁵ Even her two most direct interventions in battle focus on morale, not mechanics.²⁶ The new role of the war-goddess, and in particular its expression as replacement of Iliadic military *hetaireia*, is captured by Athena's last words in epic: an exhortation to her “dearest of all *hetairoi*” Laertes, who receives her *menos* and routs the remaining enemies of the king.²⁷ Chapter 4 ends here, as Odysseus reconquers his home with the help of humans who are not *hetairoi* and one *hetairos* who is actually a goddess.

The dissolution and replacement of *hetaireia* proceeds in roughly chronological order, beginning with the first incident after the departure from Troy, as narrated by Odysseus on Scheria, and ending with the two final battles on Ithaca. The progression can be summarized schematically:

Movement	Key events	Books
----------	------------	-------

²⁴ For the suitors as both dangerous and laughably non-military *hetairoi* see “Suitors: treacherous and twice-failed warrior-band” in Chapter 4.

²⁵ *Iliad* 5.290; 840, 853-854, 856-857; 20.438-440; 21.403-406; 22.276-277.

²⁶ *Odyssey* 22.257-259 and 275-278, discussed under “Psychological warfare: Athena's new role in battle and the autonomy of morale” in Chapter 4.

²⁷ *Odyssey* 24.516-520 (also the last appearance of *heta(i)r-* in the *Odyssey*).

Trust between Odysseus and <i>hetairoi</i> breaks down	Losing <i>hetairoi</i> against the Cicones; Odysseus loses trust in <i>hetairoi</i> among Lotus-Eaters; <i>hetairoi</i> lose trust in Odysseus on Cyclopes' island.	9
Dissention among Odysseus' <i>hetairoi</i>	The <i>hetairoi</i> , distrusting Odysseus, open the bag of the winds; Odysseus abandons all but "my" <i>hetairoi</i> (on his ship) to the Laestrygones; Odysseus divides <i>hetairoi</i> into two groups and appoints Eurylochus <i>arkhegos</i> of one	10
Odysseus' <i>hetairoi</i> destroy themselves	Eurylochus countermands Odysseus' command to <i>hetairoi</i> ; Odysseus speaks to shades in Hades without <i>hetairoi</i> ; led by Eurylochus, the <i>hetairoi</i> eat the cattle of the sun	11-12
Slaves, kin, and Athena replace <i>hetaireia</i>	Athena encourages Odysseus as Phaeacian " <i>hetairos</i> "; Eumaius has swineherd- <i>hetairoi</i> ; Odysseus' physical supporters on Ithaca are family (Telemachus, Laertes) and slaves (Eumaius, Philoitios); Telemachus' <i>hetairoi</i> disband	8, 14-16
Final battle	Suitor- <i>hetairoi</i> are killed; Odysseus wins with only <i>oikos</i> -members fighting at his side; Athena helps by psychological intervention only; Athena appears in battle as Mentor <i>hetairos</i> with Odysseus and Laertes as <i>hetairoi</i>	21-24 ²⁸

Chapter 3 covers the transition from the world of the *Iliad* to the world of the *Odyssey*, as told by Odysseus in *Odyssey* 9 through 12. Chapter 4 treats the situation on Ithaca from the prologomenal Telemachy to the final battle against the suitors' families in book 24. Thus Chapter 3 tells how *hetaireia* falls apart, and Chapter 4 discusses what replaces it.

The most striking consequence of the breakdown of *hetaireia* over the course of the *Odyssey* is that no human *hetairos* fights for Odysseus on Ithaca. New warrior-*hetairoi* do not

²⁸ The books excluded from this schema either (a) set the stage rather than actualize the dissolution and replacement of *hetaireia* (Zeus' theodicy, Athena-Mentes, and Athena-Mentor in the Telemachy) or (b) concern Odysseus' individual suffering, after *hetairoi* are dead and before he rebuilds a band of non-*hetairoi* (from Ogygia to Scheria) and his preparation to return to Penelope as husband. Passages in (a) are discussed in Chapter 4 where essential to understanding Athena's role as *hetairos*. Most of (b) is omitted only because Odysseus' relationship with Penelope is not the focus of this dissertation. While Odysseus' reunion with Penelope is of course of the greatest importance to Odysseus' *nostos*, it does not resolve two major issues raised at the beginning of Book 1 and accordingly does not close the poem (*contra* many ancient and modern analysts, many of whom want the *Odyssey* to end immediately after the reunion with Penelope at 23.296). For the dispute over *Odyssey* 24 see "Laertes the warrior-father" in Chapter 4.

replace the old warrior-*hetairoi*.²⁹ The reasons are given in Odysseus' *Apologoi* to the Phaeacians. The stepwise breakdown of *hetaireia* that Odysseus narrates leads inevitably to the catastrophic *atasthalia* promised at *Odyssey* 1.7. Odysseus tells only the first half of a story that the first eight and final twelve books complete.³⁰

1. Distrust: *hetaireia* begins to dissolve

Before *hetairoi* die, the bond of *hetaireia* falls apart. If the key feature of Iliadic *hetaireia* is trust to the point of death, the key feature of Odyssean *hetaireia* becomes distrust as Odysseus and *hetairoi* venture farther and farther from Troy.³¹ Nor does trust break down simply because hero and *hetairoi* encounter impossible situations, leading each party to suspect that the other is unable to provide support. Rather, Odysseus and *hetairoi* make a series of harmful decisions that are not necessarily entailed by the difficulty of the situation, but, on the contrary, cause a neutral situation to become dangerous or a difficult situation to become impossible. As each poor decision made by Odysseus or *hetairoi* makes the other party trust them less, each following decision is made with less concern for the well-being of the (now less-trusted) other.

The resulting spiral of distrust characterizes the sequence of incidents that begins with the departure from Troy and ends with the loss of *nostos* caused by the opening of the bag of the

²⁹ Because many non-warriors are called *hetairoi* in the *Odyssey* (as opposed to the *Iliad*, where *hetairoi* are always warriors), in Chapters 3 and 4 I will signify the respects in which each individual is called *hetairos* by a qualifier prefixed with a hyphen.

³⁰ The Telemachy suggests what will replace *hetaireia*: family (Telemachus *qua* son of Odysseus and Penelope) and slaves (Eurykleia), on the one hand, and Athena (Mentes and Mentor), on the other. But the audience does not yet know what part these characters will play in Odysseus' return. Odysseus' *Apologoi* explain why *hetaireia* must be replaced, but, although Athena is already helping him under the guise of an anonymous *hetairos* (*Odyssey* 8.200), Odysseus has no plans to build a new kind of warrior-band.

³¹ For *pistos hetairos* in the *Iliad* see Chapter 2, under "The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*." For the absence of trust as an effect of combat trauma see Part II of Shay 2002. For the "emotional estrangement" of Odysseus and the *hetairoi* see Segal 1994, 33-36.

winds. The first half of this chapter addresses the episodes in which the trust implicit in Iliadic *hetaireia* disappears from the relationship between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*.³²

1.1 Cicones and Lotus-eaters: dead and unreliable *hetairoi*

The *Odyssey* narrates not only how *hetaireia* falls apart, but also how it becomes harmful to both hero and *hetairoi* before it falls apart. These two aspects of dissolution appear in the first two episodes of Odysseus' tale to the Phaeacians.

The first episode is the battle against the Cicones. The scene recalls the *Iliad*: the attackers sack the city of Trojan allies and kill its inhabitants (ἐνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ' αὐτούς; *Odyssey* 9.40).³³ But Odysseus does not describe the victors as *hetairoi* in this passage; and when *hetairoi* do appear, for the first time in the *Odyssey*, they are the victims of a powerful Ciconian counter-attack, and their demise occasions an Ithacan lament:³⁴

στησάμενοι δ' ἐμάχοντο μάχην παρὰ νηυσὶ θοῇσι

...

ἔξ δ' ἀφ' ἐκάστης νηὸς ἐϋκνήμιδες ἑταῖροι

ὄλονθ'· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι φύγομεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε.

³² Shay 2002, drawing on modern psychiatric experience with returning war veterans, reads the *Odyssey* with a constant eye on the importance of trust among leaders and soldiers, the impossibility of unearned trust in combat, and the centrality of the breakdown of trust to the difficulty of returning home.

³³ The Cicones are Trojan allies at *Iliad* 2.846.

³⁴ The contrast between initial success against an enemy and subsequent disaster as the enemy's allies inflict vengeance sets up possible disaster in the parallel case in Book 24, as the suitors' families (who again outnumber the royal family and non-warrior allies) attempt vengeance for the suitors' deaths. But I do not see feasting after initial victory as analogous to the suitors' *bia* or the crew's illicit eating of the cattle of the sun: presumably (unless the Achaeans are all villains) neither are military raids *ipso facto* illicit in Homer nor are feasts after military victory clearly instances of self-destructive self-indulgence.

ἔσθ' ἐν προτέρῳ πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ,

ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἐταίρους.

οὐδ' ἄρα μοι προτέρῳ νῆες κίον ἀμφιέλίσσαι,

πρίν τινα τῶν δειλῶν ἐτάρων τρίς ἕκαστον αὔσαι

(*Odyssey* 9.54, 60-65)

In a single sentence (*Odyssey* 9.60-61), six *hetairoi* transition from Iliadic, insofar as they are described as “well-greaved” (ἐὺκνήμιδες ἐταῖροι), to Odyssean insofar as they are the subject of ὄλλυμι (ὄλονθ', recalling ὄλοντο at 1.7).³⁵ The rest escape—fleeing from a superior force, as they will do for the rest of their failed *nostos*, and grieving at heart for their dead, dear *hetairoi* (φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἐταίρους), as they will do repeatedly until only Odysseus remains alive. At this point, where *hetaireia* is most Iliadic, each *hetairos* is still remembered individually: the remaining Ithacans will not sleep until they cry aloud three times for each of the miserable *hetairoi* that died at the hands of the Cicones (πρίν τινα τῶν δειλῶν ἐτάρων τρίς ἕκαστον αὔσαι).³⁶

Odysseus includes himself among the mourners (first-person plural πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ). But although the group lamented each of the wretched *hetairoi* (τινα τῶν δειλῶν ἐτάρων), Odysseus himself does not name any individual *hetairos*. In comparison to the *Iliad*, the absence of naming is marked: the *hetairoi* are mourned as individuals (ἐτάρων...ἕκαστον) but remain unnamed. Dead warriors are named in the *Iliad* so frequently and incessantly that the lists can

³⁵ Six *hetairoi* are also killed by Scylla (τόφρα δέ μοι Σκύλλη γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς ἐταίρους / ἔξ ἔλεθ': *Odyssey* 12.245-246) in the last incident in which *hetairoi* are lost before their self-destruction on Thrinakia.

³⁶ The triple lament (τρίς) is ritually significant: see Heubeck 1989, 17.

seem monotonous or even numbing. In the first incident since the departure from Troy, the collective mourning for the individual *hetairoi* killed by Cicones contains none of the highly personalized grief and anger expressed by the many *hetairos*-avenging Iliadic warriors, let alone the army-destroying grief and rage of Achilles.

If the first episode of Odysseus' tale shows the death, demilitarization, and collectivization of *hetairoi*, the second episode—the delay in the land of the Lotus-Eaters—begins the erosion of trust between hero and *hetairoi* and consequently functions as the first step in the breakdown of the *hetaireia*-bond itself.

At this point Odysseus' *hetairoi* behave in a thoroughly post-Iliadic manner without the pressure of enemy assault. In the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* are reliable and self-directed: they not only help immediately when requested, but also come actively and unprompted to aid a beleaguered hero. But when they encounter the lotus-fruit, Odysseus' *hetairoi* immediately abandon their mission. The progression from Iliadic to post-Iliadic *hetaireia* is emphasized by the way the stage is set. At the beginning of the incident, Odysseus still implicitly trusts his *hetairoi*:

ἔνθα δ' ἐπ' ἠπεύρου βῆμεν καὶ ἀφυσσάμεθ' ὕδωρ,

αἶψα δὲ δεῖπνον ἔλοντο θοῆς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἑταῖροι.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ' ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,

δὴ τότε' ἐγὼν ἐτάρους προῖην πεύθεσθαι ἰόντας,

οἳ τινες ἄνδρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες.

(*Odyssey* 9.85-89)

The *hetairoi* eat a leisurely meal, and Odysseus sends some of them to investigate the land and its people. This is a task dear to Odysseus' heart, as he is characterized in the proem (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω: *Odyssey* 1.3), and at this point he trusts his *hetairoi* to investigate on their own. Odysseus is not to blame for the misadventure that follows, for the Lotus-Eaters mean his *hetairoi* no harm:

οὐδ' ἄρα Λωτοφάγοι μῆδονθ' ἐτάροισιν ὄλεθρον

ἡμετέροισ', ἀλλὰ σφι δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι.

(*Odyssey* 9.92-93)

Although the Lotus-eaters are innocuous, the investigation nearly proves disastrous, not because of unexpected military opposition as at Ismarus, but rather because Odysseus' *hetairoi* forget about their *nostos* when they eat the lotus-fruit:

ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ βούλοντο μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισι

λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι μενέμεν νόστου τε λαθέσθαι.³⁷

(*Odyssey* 9.96-97)

This is the first time an error made by Odysseus' *hetairoi* interferes with their *nostos*—the earliest echo of the *atasthalia* promised in the proem. Unlike the final *atasthalia* on Thrinakia, wherein the *hetairoi* choose one good (cessation of hunger) over another (*nostos*), this error is simple: some of the *hetairoi* forget about their final good (*nostos*) altogether. The immediate

³⁷ See Shay 2002, 35-41 for the lure of drug-induced oblivion as a returning warrior's response to combat trauma. Cf. Helen's pharmacological solution to the 'memory of all evils': αὐτίκ' ἄρ' εἰς οἶνον βάλε φάρμακον, ἔνθεν ἔπινον,

νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπὶ λήθον ἀπάντων (*Odyssey* 4.220-221).

result is the first strong division between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*. Odysseus must now use force to compel his unwilling men to return home, chaining them to the boat and commanding the rest of his trusty *hetairoi* to put out to sea:

τοὺς μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη,

νηυσὶ δ' ἐνὶ γλαφυρῇσιν ὑπὸ ζυγὰ δῆσα ἐρύσσας·

αὐτὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμην ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους

σπερχομένους νηῶν ἐπιβαινέμεν ὠκειάων,

μὴ πὼς τις λωτοῖο φαγὼν νόστοιο λάθηται.

(*Odyssey* 9.98-103)

Odysseus must compel them even as they resist his command (ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη). He must physically bind them under the thwarts (ὑπὸ ζυγὰ), as they later bind him to the mast before the last ship approaches the Sirens (*Odyssey* 12.148-150)—another temptation that, like the lotus-fruit, does not so much compete with *nostos* as remove *nostos* from thought altogether. Some *hetairoi* have not eaten the lotus; these he describes using a common Iliadic phrase (ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους). These *hetairoi* are contrasted with the lotus-eating *hetairoi*, splitting Odysseus' group as Iliadic *hetairoi* are never split.³⁸ But now Odysseus must treat all his *hetairoi* with protective care: he feels that these *hetairoi* too will forget about *nostos* if any one of them eats the lotus-fruit. The *hetairoi* have merited both division and distrust, to the point of temporary subjugation

³⁸ The only oblique exception is Agamemnon, who sets “your[=Achilles’] *hetairoi*” against “my[=Agamemnon’s] *hetairoi*” at *Iliad* 1.178-187. For this exception as an anomaly characteristic of Agamemnon’s ill-considered rhetoric see Chapter 1, under “Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans.”

(ὕπὸ ζυγά). The persuasive style of command that is typical in the *Iliad* has no effect among fantastical wonders.³⁹

1.2 The Cyclopes' island: Odysseus loses the trust of his *hetairoi*

After leaving Troy, Odysseus' *hetairoi* first die in a surprise counter-attack and then lose sight of their homecoming, thanks to the mind-altering effects of the lotus fruit, forcing Odysseus first to flee and then to compel the *hetairoi* back to sea. In the third episode on the return from Troy, the disappointment is reversed: on the Cyclopes' island, Odysseus catastrophically lets down his *hetairoi*. As the lotus-eating *hetairoi* proved themselves poor companions to the hero, so the Cyclops-seeking hero proves himself a poor commander to his *hetairoi*. After this episode the trust implied by Iliadic *hetaireia* is severely eroded in both directions.

The erosion of trust begins as a spiral. Among the Lotus-Eaters, Odysseus sent some *hetairoi* to investigate the inhabitants (*Odyssey* 9.88). They did not come back on their own; they have earned Odysseus' distrust. Accordingly, when the group next makes landfall, Odysseus leads the investigative expedition himself:

ἄλλοι μὲν νῦν μίμνεν', ἐμοὶ ἐρήρηες ἐταῖροι·

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηϊ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν

ἐλθὼν τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν πειρήσομαι, οἳ τινὲς εἰσιν,

ἧ ῥ' οἳ γ' ὕβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,

³⁹ Insofar as the lotus-fruit significantly affects the mind (λάθηται), Odysseus' *hetairoi* are not fully responsible for their actions (at least not in some strong Kantian moral sense). But this does not mean that eating the lotus-fruit is not self-destructive, nor that Odysseus is unjustified in applying the stern discipline of physical force: see Shay 2002, chapter 4 (drawing an analogy between the lotus-fruit and “chemical attempts to forget with alcohol or drugs”).

ἦε φιλόξεينوι, καί σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής.

(*Odyssey* 9.172-176)

Odysseus' opening address appeals to *hetaireia* explicitly, and even includes a rare vocative of *hetairoi*.⁴⁰ The bond has twice been weakened, so he twice appeals to the link between himself and his *hetairoi* (ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι... ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν). But Odysseus does not allow these *hetairoi* the autonomy he gave his *hetairoi* at Ismarus. He tells most of them to stay put (μῖμνετ') while he leads his own special group of "my ship and my *hetairoi*" (σὺν νηϊ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν)⁴¹ on the same sort of investigation.⁴² But even the sub-group designated as "mine" is not good enough. The next time he mentions *hetairoi*, he picks out the twelve best to accompany him to the Cyclops' cave:

δὴ τότε τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμην ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους

αὐτοῦ παρ νηϊ τε μένειν καὶ νῆα ἔρυσθαι

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κρίνας ἐτάρων δυοκαίδεκα' ἀρίστους

⁴⁰ For direct address to *hetairoi* in the vocative in the *Iliad* (Achilles and Patroclus only) see Chapter 2, under "Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons." For the role of direct address to vocative *hetairoi* in the disaster at Thrinakia see below, under "From dissent to death: Eurylochus and the *hetairoi* destroy themselves."

⁴¹ ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν appears four other times in the *Odyssey*. In three cases, ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν refers either to Odysseus' *hetairoi* in general or to a subgroup selected for a specific, temporary purpose. In one case (*Odyssey* 10.128), it refers to the *hetairoi* on Odysseus' ship. Odysseus presumably does distinguish the *hetairoi* on his ship from the *hetairoi* on other ships (simply out of nautical necessity), but uses the same term to refer to both the general group and also the specific subgroup. For more on the significance of ἐμοῖς' ἐτάροισιν see below, under "The Laestrygonian incident: Odysseus abandons all but 'my *hetairoi*.'"

⁴² He tweaks the objective slightly: whereas on the previous island the object of inquiry was the "land and people" (ἄνδρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ), here the object is the people's moral character and mind (νόος). The word νόος recalls the proem, where Odysseus learned about the cities and minds of many men (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω). The absence of *noos* from the first, *hetairoi*-led investigation subtly hints at the difference between Odysseus and his men.

βῆν...

(*Odyssey* 9.193-196)

The stratification of *hetairoi* into those who stay and those who come along, on the one hand, and the further distinction (κρίνας) of *hetairoi* into the “best” (ἀρίστους) who venture with Odysseus and the “rest” (ἄλλους) who do not, is already a sign of the shakiness of the relationship between king and *hetairoi*. Some he can trust, to varying degrees. Others he cannot.

The foolishness of the *hetairoi* during the lotus-eating episode perhaps justifies this division. But foolishness does not belong to *hetairoi* alone. When Odysseus and his picked twelve finally reach the Cyclops’ cave and steal his cheese, Odysseus’ own recklessness is directly opposed by the prudence of the *hetairoi*:

ἔνθ’ ἐμὲ μὲν πρώτισθ’ ἔταροι λίσσονται ἐπέεσσι

τυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἰέναι πάλιν...

ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην, ἦ τ’ ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν,

ὄφρ’ αὐτόν τε ἴδοιμι, καὶ εἴ μοι ξείνια δοίη.

οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔμελλ’ ἐτάροισι φανεῖς ἐρατεινὸς ἔσεσθαι.

(*Odyssey* 9.224-225, 228-230)

The *hetairoi* are now cautious: they want to return immediately after stealing cheese from the cave. This time Odysseus is foolish and the *hetairoi* are wise. But he will not be persuaded (οὐ πιθόμην), despite their entreaty (λίσσονται). The word πιθόμην recalls and negates a common Iliadic response to commands and particularly Patroclus’ response to his *hetairos* Achilles. In the *Iliad*, *hetaireia* generates persuasion/obedience (*peith-*). In the *Odyssey*, it does not. Odysseus’

response is thus not a lovely sign for his *hetairoi* (οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλ' ἐτάροισι φανεῖς ἐρατεινός) in two ways: first, many of them will die; and second, there is no trust (ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην) between them. In the episode at Ismarus, Odysseus was forced to play autocrat to incompetents; but on the Cyclopes' island he proves himself an erring autocrat over wiser men as well, as the narrator-Odysseus clearly admits (ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν). When the king is in error, as Odysseus soon proves to be, the *hetairoi* can do nothing to save either him or themselves. As trust broken in one direction leads to trust broken in the other, the dissolution of *hetaireia* begins to spiral out of control.

Ignored by their commander at the moment of decision, Odysseus' *hetairoi* remain passive for the rest of the episode. But Odysseus again proves himself unable to save some of them from his foolish decision. When Odysseus fails to smooth-talk his way to safety, the Cyclops kills and eats two *hetairoi*.⁴³ When the Cyclops falls asleep, Odysseus prays to Athena and a *boule* suddenly appears to him—not a suggestion from *hetairoi*, as they had offered before he ignored them (λίσσοντ'...ἰέναι πάλιν).⁴⁴ Instead of mutually beneficial deliberation and persuasion among hero and *hetairoi* (which, in the absence of mutual trust, is now impossible), the hero saves the *hetairoi* through a plan conceived without mortal aid and received after a prayer to a god. The plan offers a brief glimpse of good *hetaireia*, encapsulated by the image of

⁴³ The terms that refer to the human group change subtly throughout this scene. Odysseus introduces himself and his men as the 'laoi of Agamemnon' (λαοὶ δ' Ἀτρεΐδew Ἀγαμέμνονος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι: *Odyssey* 9.263), not as hero and *hetairoi*. He presents the group as *xenoi* (ἰκόμεθ', εἴ τι πόροις ξεινήϊον ἡὲ καὶ ἄλλως / δοίης δωτίνην, ἦ τε **ξεινῶν** θέμις ἐστίν: 267-268), hoping that the appeal to *themis* and Zeus (270) will persuade Polyphemos to treat them well. Polyphemos does see the group as hero plus companions, as he threatens Odysseus and *hetairoi* using separate substantives (περιδοίμην / οὔτε σεῦ οὔθ' ἐτάρων: 277-278), and narrator-Odysseus calls the men *hetairoi* again when Polyphemos kills and eats the first two (ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἀναΐξας ἐτάροισ' ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλε: 288). See Haubold 2000, 128-133 for the terminology in this scene (making the point that 'hetairos' is focalized, as I argue in non-narratological terms in Chapter 1).

⁴⁴ The plan is not directly attributed to Athena, but the juxtaposition at *Odyssey* 9.317-318 is suggestive: εἴ πως τεισαίμην, δοίη δέ μοι εὖχος Ἀθήνη / ἥδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή.

Odysseus commanding the *hetairoi* to sharpen the Cyclops' club (καὶ παρέθηχ' ἐτάροισιν, ἀποξῦναι δ' ἐκέλευσα) while he himself sharpens the tip (ἐγὼ δ' ἐθόωσα παραστάς / ἄκρον). As on the Iliadic battlefield, here in the Cyclops' cave the hero is the spearhead for a violent attack that requires the participation of nearby *hetairoi*.

For all the leadership that Odysseus displays in the deployment of the sharpened stake, the quasi-Iliadic character of this *hetaireia* is strongly undercut by the aspects of Odysseus' trickery that actually bring the remnant *hetairoi* to safety. Whereas in the *Iliad* the hero leads as the most visible among *hetairoi*, here in the Cyclops' cave Odysseus leads the escape under the name of Nobody—a self-erasing naming that ultimately isolates Polyphemus from his Cyclopean companions and allows the Ithacan ship to escape.⁴⁵ But the *hetairoi* themselves remain Iliadic even as their commander begins to rely on mind rather than strength. Odysseus encourages them (ἔπεσσι δὲ πάντας ἐταίρους / θάρσυνον: 376-377). They stand around him (ἄμφι δ' ἐταῖροι / ἴσταντ': 380-381), recalling the common combination of *amph-* with *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*. But again the causal root of the *hetaireia*-group is reassigned: while Odysseus encouraged (*thars-*) the *hetairoi* five lines earlier, here a *daimon* is given credit for the “great courage” that inspires the union of hero with *hetairoi* (αὐτὰρ θάρσος ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα δαίμων: 381), a divine anonymity that contrasts with the careful individuation of Olympian helpers in the *Iliad*.⁴⁶ Both the centrality of the hero to *hetaireia* and the role of the gods in *hetaireia* are altered even as hero and *hetairoi* work together to escape a monster.

⁴⁵ Polyphemus promises to eat Odysseus-Nobody “last, after his *hetairoi*” (*Odyssey* 9.369): οὗτιν ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷσ' ἐτάροισι. For the significance of the name ‘Outis’ see especially Austin 1972.

⁴⁶ The anonymous *daimon* is never the agent of encouragement in the *Iliad*; the word appears most commonly in the phrase δαίμονι ἴσος. For gods in the *Iliad* versus the *Odyssey* see Chapter 4, discussion and bibliography under “Post-war *hetairoi* fleeing the gods” and “Cosmic justice and Odysseus’ *nostos*: Athena-*hetairos*’ twofold mission.”

Whatever traces of Iliadic *hetaireia* appear in the collaboration against the Cyclops, the bond between hero and *hetairoi* continues to fall apart. Sailing away from the island, Odysseus reverts to his former recklessness and proclaims his name to the danger of the entire group.

Again the *hetairoi* know better than Odysseus:

ἄλλ’ ὅτε δὴ δις τόσσον ἄλα πρήσσοντες ἀπῆμεν,
καὶ τότε δὴ Κύκλωπα προσηύδων· ἄμφι δ’ ἑταῖροι
μειλιχίοισ’ ἐπέεσσιν ἐρήτυον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος·
σχέτλιε, τίπτ’ ἐθέλεις ἐρεθιζέμεν ἄγριον ἄνδρα;...

(*Odyssey* 9.491-494)

In rebuking Odysseus they surround him (ἄμφι δ’ ἑταῖροι) and speak from alternating sides (ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος), forming their own group in prudence apart from his foolishness (σχέτλιε). The first time they rightly opposed a decision of his, they addressed him directly—but he was not persuaded (ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην: *Odyssey* 9.224-230), and they disastrously entered Polyphemus’ cave. Now they speak together against him; and although Odysseus hears them this time as well, he ignores them a second time—again in an act of negated persuasion/trust (*peith-*):

ὥς φάσαν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πειθόν ἐμὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν

(*Odyssey* 9.500)

The entire Cyclops incident destroys the trust Odysseus' *hetairoi* have for their commander, but especially his two refusals of their sensible advice.⁴⁷

The result of Odysseus' insensibility to the persuasion of his *hetairoi* is the Cyclops' curse. As a result of Odysseus' self-revelation, his *hetairoi* are subject to the curse as well. Although the Cyclops is angry primarily at Odysseus, the *hetairoi* are named as object of his curse (ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἑταίρους: 534) in the lexical unit (ὄλλωμι+*hetair*-) that first describes the destruction of the *hetairoi* in the proem (ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὧς ἑτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰέμενός περ / αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο: *Odyssey* 1.6-7) and that is repeated as a refrain for the central disaster of the *Odyssey*. The same phrase closes Book 9 (φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἑταίρους: 9.566). It is now justified that the *hetairoi* should not trust Odysseus to keep them safe, for Odysseus too makes foolish decisions that bring destruction on the *hetairoi*.⁴⁸

2. Dissention: rebellion, restructuring, retreat

By the end of Book 9, *hetairoi* and Odysseus have both lost one another's trust. Among the Lotus-Eaters, the *hetairoi* do not take care of themselves; among the Cyclopes, Odysseus does not take care of his *hetairoi*. Neither threat to *nostos* is unavoidable. But despite the promise of the proem, Odysseus' choice to enter the Cyclops' cave takes away *nostos* from more returning warriors than does the choice of the *hetairoi* to eat the lotus-fruit. Forgetfulness kills nobody; Odysseus rescues his short-sighted *hetairoi* without permanent harm. But Polyphemus

⁴⁷ On Aiaia Eurylochus cites the Cyclops incident as evidence that Odysseus' foolishness has killed *hetairoi* in the past (*Odyssey* 10.435-437): ὧς περ Κύκλωψ ἔρξ', ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἵκοντο / ἡμέτεροι ἑταροι, σὺν δ' ὁ θρασὺς εἶπετ' Ὀδυσσεύς / τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο.

⁴⁸ For scholarship on *dike* and Odysseus' actions on the Cyclopes' island see Friedrich 1991 (arguing that Odysseus' *hybris* is a stage in his development as a character).

kills six *hetairoi* and Odysseus' parting boast opens the rest of "my *hetairoi*" to a barrage of Cyclopean boulders.

Moreover, the eating of the lotus-fruit is merely a mistake. Nobody warned the *hetairoi* of any harmful effects. But Odysseus decides to enter the Cyclops' cave against the explicit warning of the *hetairoi*. The adventure that kills multiple companions is more than unavoidable. It is a willful rejection of *hetaireia* on Odysseus' part, a deliberate dismissal of the good advice of the *hetairoi*, as Hector disastrously rejected Poulydamas' good counsel in *Iliad* 18. In response to the second dismissal, the *hetairoi* group together and again speak against their king (ἀμφὶ δ' ἐταῖροι... ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος). Odysseus plants the seed of *stasis* himself. The fruit, borne in Book 10, is open dissent, beginning with a minor mutiny that (again by mistake) robs *hetairoi* of their homecoming; and the appointment of a new co-commander who fails to protect his *hetairoi* from another magical danger and, in Book 12, leads the *hetairoi*, against Odysseus' divinely sanctioned advice, to destroy themselves.

2.1 From distrust to dissent: mutiny off the Ithacan shore

With Iliadic *hetaireia* now fallen apart, mutual distrust among hero and *hetairoi* spirals into autocracy, on the one hand, and rebellion, on the other. The post-*hetaireia* pathology becomes political as soon as the Ithacan force leaves the Cyclopes' island. After the ships receive copious gifts from Aeolus, they sail within sight of Ithaca itself. Then Homer provides a nearly political image of pure one-man control:

ἔνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἐπέλλαβε κεκμηῶτα·

αἰεὶ γὰρ πόδα νηὸς ἐνώμων, οὐδέ τ' ἄλλω

δῶχ' ἐτάρων, ἵνα θᾶσσον ἰκοίμεθα πατρίδα γαῖαν·

(*Odyssey* 10.31-33)

Odysseus remains awake because he cannot trust any *hetairos* to steer the ship.⁴⁹ He falls asleep because he cannot stay awake forever. The dative singular τῷ ἄλλῳ with the genitive plural ἐτάρων shows the *hetairoi* as a group whose members are distinguished from their single controller.⁵⁰ Odysseus is in charge, not only *of* his *hetairoi*, but also *instead of* any one (τῷ ἄλλῳ) of his *hetairoi*. This command structure is unintelligible in the framework of Iliadic *hetaireia*. Nowhere does an Iliadic king take charge instead of *hetairoi*. On the contrary, Achilles' greatest mistake is to appoint his dearest *hetairos* commander when only Achilles himself ought to have led the Myrmidons against Hector; and Achilles rebukes himself in the voice of "some" *hetairos* for keeping the Myrmidon *hetairoi* from battle against their will.⁵¹ But *hetaireia* has so deteriorated that Odysseus feels that none of his *hetairoi* can be trusted to steer the ship, even in sight of the Ithacan shore.

The proto-political image is followed by quasi-political action. The *hetairoi* form a mutiny, a *stasis* opposed to the king. Again they speak among themselves—but this time out of

⁴⁹ Contrast the trustworthiness of the ships of the Phaeacians, which at *Odyssey* 8.557-559 need neither *kubernetes* nor *pedalion* because they themselves know the thoughts and minds of humans (ἀλλ' αὐταὶ ἴσασι νοήματα καὶ φρένας ἀνδρῶν). For Odysseus' refusal to cede control of the ship as an effect of combat trauma see Shay 2002, 51-57.

⁵⁰ The image describes a collective with a single controller (*kubernetes*; the term is not used but the concept is activated by αἰεὶ γάρ) and prefigures the metaphor of the 'ship of state', first elaborated explicitly by Alcaeus but also present in Theognis and Archilochus (for the history of this image see Gerber 1997 142n21; Thompson 2008 esp. 167ff; Brock 2013, chapter 4). In the political image, the *demos* is passive and needs to be led. Here the *hetairoi* are passive and need to be led. The steersman must take charge because the subjects cannot be trusted to keep themselves safe. The ship magnifies the need for an autocrat because everyone on a ship quite literally floats or sinks together (whence the English idiom 'in the same boat'). The nautical setting of the *Odyssey* is susceptible to autocracy, but Odysseus' explicit statement that he refused to entrust the tiller to any of the *hetairoi* suggests that it is conceivable, and perhaps even normal, that someone besides Odysseus himself should steer the ship.

⁵¹ *Iliad* 16.203-206, discussed in Chapter 2, under "Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons."

Odysseus' hearing, while he is asleep.⁵² Their reasoning begins with the assumption that Odysseus does not deserve their trust:

οἱ δ' ἕταροι ἐπέεσσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον

καί μ' ἔφασαν χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον οἴκαδ' ἄγεσθαι

...

ὦ πόποι, ὥς ὃδε πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιός ἐστιν

ἀνθρώποις, ὅτεών κε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἵκηται.

πολλὰ μὲν ἐκ Τροίης ἄγεται κειμήλια καλὰ

ληΐδος· ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε ὁμὴν ὁδὸν ἐκτελέσαντες

οἴκαδε νισόμεθα κενεὰς σὺν χεῖρας ἔχοντες.

(*Odyssey* 10.34-35, 38-42)

What the *hetairoi* accuse Odysseus of here, is what Achilles accuses Agamemnon of in *Iliad* 1: taking all the spoils for himself, an unforgivable crime against the economic foundation of warrior-companionship. There Achilles was correct, and here Odysseus' *hetairoi* are wrong. Aeolus' bag contains only the winds, instruments for *nostos*. But after Odysseus' leadership on the Cyclopes' island, the suspicion of the *hetairoi* is understandable, if unfounded.⁵³ The evil counsel of the *hetairoi* is victorious (βουλή δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἐταίρων: 46) – cf. Odysseus' good

⁵² Contrast *Odyssey* 9.493 where they speak from both sides of the ship and Odysseus hears (but is not persuaded). Here Odysseus is asleep (10.31), as they conspire under Eurylochus when Odysseus falls asleep on Thrinakia.

⁵³ So also Rutherford 1986, 151 (“understandably, they do not trust him”) and Segal 1994, 34 (on the opening of the bag of the winds: “the most painful failure of trust between Odysseus and the companions”).

boule at *Odyssey* 9.318 – the winds escape, and the spiral of mistrust results in the most tantalizing disappointment: the removal of homecoming in sight of home. The *hetairoi* groan (στενάχοντο δ' ἑταῖροι: 55) with a verb that in the *Iliad* responds to death.

That the dysfunction of *hetaireia* holds in both directions is manifest in Odysseus' attempt to recapture the winds. Re-supplicating Aeolus, Odysseus blames his “bad” *hetairoi* and sleep itself for the loss of the guest-gift:

ἄσάν μ' ἑταροὶ τε κακοὶ πρὸς τοῖσί τε ὕπνος

(*Odyssey* 10.68)

Odysseus presents himself to Aeolus as the direct object of ἄσαν—the victim of *ate*, whose agents are his own *hetairoi*, along with the sleep that kept him from retaining absolute control over the ship (cf. *Odyssey* 10.32-33).⁵⁴ The strength of the accusation is matched by an equally damning adjective: nowhere else in Homer are *hetairoi* called *kakoi*. Odysseus' words to Aeolus are also more accusatory than his narrative twenty lines earlier, where the agent of the error of the *hetairoi* is simply “evil counsel” (βουλή δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἑταίρων: 46). In conversation with hosts and kings, he feels particularly that he must scapegoat his *hetairoi*. But the ploy does not work, as Aeolus declares that Odysseus is personally hateful to the gods (ἄνδρα τὸν ὅς τε θεοῖσιν ἀπέχθεται μακάρεσσιν: 74). Odysseus has ruined his relationship both with his *hetairoi* and with a royal *xenos*.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ This is probably a deliberate rhetorical ploy for Aeolus' ears only: in his narrative to the Phaeacians, Odysseus implicates himself along with his *hetairoi* (αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθ' ἀφραδίησιν: *Odyssey* 10.27).

⁵⁵ Aeolus triply cuts off all future relations with Odysseus, calling him “most reproachful of living things,” judging his request “not right” (οὐ θέμις), and concluding that the gods must hate him (*Odyssey* 10.72-75).

2.2 The Laestrygonian incident: Odysseus abandons all but “my *hetairoi*”

The bag of the winds contained no spoils, but the Laestrygonian disaster, which immediately follows Aeolus’ refusal to offer another guest-gift, suggests that the *hetairoi* were correct to suspect that Odysseus prefers his interests to theirs. Most of the remaining *hetairoi* die in obedience to Odysseus’ next order. But Odysseus survives by setting himself and “my *hetairoi*” apart from the bulk of the expeditionary force, exempting himself and a few companions from the danger of the unknown shore:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἷος σχέθον ἔξω νῆα μέλαιναν,
αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατιῇ, πέτρης ἐκ πείσματα δῆσας.
ἔστιν δὲ σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσιν ἀνελθών·
ἔνθα μὲν οὔτε βοῶν οὔτ’ ἀνδρῶν φαίνετο ἔργα,
καπνὸν δ’ οἷον ὀρῶμεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς αἴσσοντα.
δὴ τότε’ ἐγὼν ἐτάρους προῖην πεύθεσθαι ἰόντας,
οἳ τινες ἄνδρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες,
ἄνδρε δύω κρίνας, τρίτατον κήρυχ’ ἅμ’ ὀπάσσας.
...αὐτίχ’ ἕνα μάρψας ἐτάρων ὀπλίσσατο δεῖπνον
...αἶψα δ’ ἐμοῖς’ ἐτάροισιν ἐποτρύνας ἐκέλευσα
ἐμβαλέειν κόπησ’, ἵν’ ὑπὲρ κακότητα φύγοιμεν·
(*Odyssey* 10.95-102, 116, 128-129)

Here in the Laestrygonian harbor, Odysseus alone (ἐγὼν οἶος) hangs back with his own ship and his own *hetairoi* (ἐμοῖσ' ἐτάροισιν). On the Cyclopes' island, Odysseus took the greatest risk on himself—foolishly, to be sure, but in solidarity with at least some of his companions. Now Odysseus prudently keeps his own ship far from the majority that have moored deeper in the harbor, sending an expedition of three *hetairoi* to die in a battle against monsters whose invincibility he might reasonably have suspected.⁵⁶

The term “my *hetairoi*” (ἐμοῖσ' ἐτάροισιν) is marked. In Homer, the phrase signifies either extreme divisiveness or extreme intimacy with *hetairoi*. In the *Iliad*, the phrase is used only by Agamemnon and Achilles, the negative and positive extremes of Achaean *hetaireia*: once by Agamemnon, to separate “my *hetairoi*” from “your *hetairoi*” during the speech in which he claims Briseis from Achilles; and twice by Achilles, first to deny the thinnest possibility of quarter to Hector for “killing my *hetairoi*,” and second to gather “my *hetairoi*,” the Myrmidons, in lament for their dead companion Patroclus.⁵⁷ In the *Odyssey*, the phrase appears only at three critical or poignant moments. The first two are *Odyssey* 9.173 and 10.128, the Cyclops and Laestrygonian passages just discussed—the first a case of the commander leading a risky expedition, the second a case of the commander avoiding it. The third is *Odyssey* 11.78, where

⁵⁶ Presumably he has learned about the dangers of mysterious harbors from the incident on the Cyclopes' island and now hangs back prudently. But in the *Iliad* narrative, heroes do not hang back while sending their men into danger. At *Iliad* 1.226-227, Achilles accuses Agamemnon (perhaps unfairly) of hanging back and letting his men suffer the danger and exhaustion of battle (οὔτε ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον ἅμα λαῶ θωρηχθῆναι / οὔτε λόχον δ' ἰέναι σὺν ἀριστήεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν) – just as Odysseus actually does at *Odyssey* 10.95. The situations are not analogous from the perspective of moral responsibility, of course: Agamemnon's expedition is not fighting against man-eating giants.

⁵⁷ For ‘my *hetairoi*’ in the *Iliad* see Chapter 2, under “Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans” and “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

Elpenor asks Odysseus to bury him with the oar he used while he lived and rowed among “my *hetairoi*.”⁵⁸

Thus in the *Iliad*, “my *hetairoi*” signifies either extreme intimacy or the isolation of a poor commander. In the *Odyssey*, “my *hetairoi*” connotes a feeling of intimacy but denotes an attitude that accompanies the commander’s departure from the majority of his companions. Odysseus’ words do not turn “my *hetairoi*” into enemies of “your *hetairoi*,” as Agamemnon’s do; nor do they construct a set of intimates that includes commander and companions, as Achilles’ do. Rather, Odysseus’ use of ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισιν distinguishes the *hetairoi* with whom the hero lives and adventures from the *hetairoi* from whom the hero is separated—at first by expedition, but finally by death.

The Laestrygonian incident erases the last pretense of mutual *hetaireia*. The spiral of distrust that begins when many *hetairoi* abandon their *nostos* on the island of the Lotus-Eaters reaches its nadir when the king leaves most of his *hetairoi* on an island of man-eating giants. The actions of hero and *hetairoi* set commander and commanded mutually at odds. No longer bound by trust, but still in the same boat after the winds and the Laestrygonians, either Odysseus or his companions will be destroyed before anyone reaches home.⁵⁹ Even Odysseus’ heroic rescue of his companions on Aiaia has only temporary effect.

2.3 Aiaia: from no *hetaireia* to two companies of *hetairoi*

⁵⁸ ταῦτά τέ μοι τελέσαι πῆξαί τ’ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἑρετμόν, / τῷ καὶ ζωδὸς ἔρεσσον ἐὼν μετ’ ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισιν. Obviously rowing is significant for Odysseus’ companionship as well: in Teiresias’ prophecy, he will journey alone, and his separation from the sea will be signified by the inhabitants’ ignorance of the oar. For rower-*hetairoi* see Chapter 4, under “The new *hetairoi*: sailors, suitors, steward, and slaves.”

⁵⁹ The Laestrygonian passage highlights the difference between the Odysseus of the proem (Pucci 1998, 13: “paternally attentive to the welfare of his own men”) and the Odysseus who returns to Ithaca.

The disaster on Aiaia transforms distrust into the seeds of destruction. Blown back from *nostos* by the winds released by suspicious *hetairoi*, escaped from the Laestrygonians by abandoning all *hetairoi* but “mine,” Odysseus on Aiaia tries desperately to protect the remainder of “my *hetairoi*.” But the *hetairoi* are both more helpless and more intractable than ever. Odysseus tries to lead them without requiring trust; then he delegates partial command to one of the *hetairoi*, Eurylochus. The splitting of the group proves catastrophic. The new commander fails to protect his *hetairoi* from Circe. Later, in Book 12, he will lead all the *hetairoi* in a final mutiny against Odysseus – persuading them, by explicit appeal to *hetaireia*, to kill and eat the cattle of the sun.

The introduction to the Aiaia episode presents the new situation clearly and thereby sets the stage for the final split and self-destruction. At landfall, Odysseus himself remains *polymetis*: he explores the new territory, satisfying his own curiosity. But he no longer sends *hetairoi* on expedition; and he provisions them as if they were purely passive, keeping them alive not by leading but by feeding them via his own heroic strength. He arms himself and ventures forth emphatically alone:

καὶ τότε ἔγων ἐμὸν ἔγχος ἐλὼν καὶ φάσγανον ὄξυ

καρπαλίμως παρὰ νηὸς ἀνήϊον ἐς περιωπὴν

(*Odyssey* 10.145-146).⁶⁰

⁶⁰ 10.170-171 perhaps symbolizes Odysseus’ aloneness without *hetaireia*. He leans on his spear in order to carry the deer he just killed, since he could not carry the spear in his other hand, because the beast was huge (ἔγχει ἐρειδόμενος, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶς ἦεν ἐπ’ ὤμου / χειρὶ φέρειν ἑτέρῃ· μάλα γὰρ μέγα θηρίον ἦεν) – a problem of crude bulk that the presence of *hetairoi* would have solved.

He kills a deer to feed his *hetairoi*, providing for them like a paternal king, but he cannot rouse them without “gentle” words:

καὶ δ' ἔβαλον προπάροιθε νεός, **ἀνέγειρα δ' ἑταίρους**

μειλιχίους' ἐπέεσσι παρασταδὸν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον·

... ὥς ἐφάμην, οἱ δ' ὄκα ἐμοῖς' ἐπέεσσι πίθοντο·

(*Odyssey* 10.172-173, 177)

The phrase **μειλιχίους' ἐπέεσσι** often denotes wily persuasion in a situation without trust, when someone wants to get something from someone else.⁶¹ Nowhere else in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* are **μειλιχίους' ἐπέεσσι** directed explicitly toward *hetairoi*.⁶² Odysseus' gentle words do generate obedience/persuasion (ἐμοῖς' ἐπέεσσι πίθοντο), but only to the extent of persuading the *hetairoi* to eat a meal. This is the extent of trust among hero and *hetairoi* when Circe enters the story.

The proem promises that the *hetairoi* will destroy themselves by their own *atasthalia* by eating the cattle of the sun. But Odysseus himself forges on Aiaia the first link in the causal chain that leads to Thrinakia. The sequence is simple: the *hetairoi* eat Helios' cattle because Eurylochos leads them, and Eurylochos leads the *hetairoi* because Odysseus appoints him commander of half the crew (*Odyssey* 10.205). Odysseus does not lose control of his men until Book 12, but already on Aiaia Eurylochos begins to rebel.

⁶¹ E.g. *Odyssey* 6.141-147 (Odysseus beseeches Nausicaa with **μειλιχίους' ἐπέεσσι** – no trust between strangers); 9.493 (the Ithacan *hetairoi* petition Odysseus to leave the Cyclops' cave with the stolen cheese – no trust for their commander, whom they cannot persuade [*peith-*]); 10.457 and 12.207 (no trust between Odysseus and misled *hetairoi*); 11.552 (fear and sorrow from Odysseus to Achilles' shade); 18.283 (Penelope beguiles the suitors). On a gross statistical level: **μειλιχίους' ἐπέεσσι** appears twelve times in the *Odyssey* but only three times in the *Iliad*.

⁶² But cf. *Odyssey* 10.422, where Odysseus addresses gentle words to men described as *hetairoi* immediately after the speech – but only as objects of Eurylochos' resistance (429).

The roots of the secession lie in Odysseus' attempt to salvage *hetaireia*. After the catastrophe in the Laestrygonian harbor; after a hearty meal provided to the *hetairoi* via Odysseus' personal hunting prowess; and after a satisfying sleep, Odysseus weakly attempts to renew the spirits of his *hetairoi* as the day dawns:

ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,

καὶ τότε γῶν ἀγορὴν θέμενος μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπον·

[κέκλυτέ μευ μύθων, **κακά περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι**]

ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ ἴδμεν ὅπη ζόφος οὐδ' ὅπη ἠώς...

(*Odyssey* 10.188-191)

Odysseus' opening words are so surprising that they appear spurious. The line is rhetorically awkward, insofar as it results in a strangely duplicated opening: ὦ φίλοι commonly opens a speech and here appears on the next line. The phrase **κακά περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι** appears only three times in Homer. The other two cases are paired (*Odyssey* 12.271 and 340) and open speeches that could not begin without them. But the interpolation is thematically sound. The expedition has turned itself back in sight of land; all but one ship's crew of *hetairoi* have just been eaten by giants; and Odysseus is not about to give them any reason for hope. The trip since Troy has truly consisted of **κακά**; the actions of the *hetairoi* since Troy are accurately described by **πάσχοντες**; and Odysseus asks them to listen despite these evils, which he nevertheless expects to continue – an admission captured by the emphatic or concessive **περ**. Even his special virtues may prove useless in this densely wooded, sight-denying land:⁶³ his speech denies that

⁶³ *Odyssey* 10.197: ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ὕλην.

even *metis* is left for them.⁶⁴ The *hetairoi* care more for *hetaireia* than for Odysseus' leadership, as they recall the comrades they lost on two previous islands and weep (*Odyssey* 10.198-201). But Odysseus does not weep. The affective split between Odysseus and *hetairoi* is given a rational explanation: weeping is unproductive (ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις ἐγίνετο μυρομένοισιν: 202). Unlike Achilles in the *Iliad*, who shares lament with "my *hetairoi*" as soon as his dearest *hetairos* is avenged, Odysseus can no longer afford fellow-feeling.⁶⁵

Odysseus can do nothing more than make his *hetairoi* lament. But inasmuch as *nostos* is still not achieved, while the *hetairoi* weep fruitlessly, the commander tries to break the streak of island catastrophes by restructuring his forces, by splitting the well-greaved *hetairoi* in two:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ δίχα πάντας ἐϋκνήμιδας ἑταίρους⁶⁶

ἡρίθμεον, ἀρχὸν δὲ μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ὅπασσα·

τῶν μὲν ἐγὼν ἦρχον, τῶν δ' Εὐρύλοχος θεοειδής.

(*Odyssey* 10.203-205)

The split is a response to the hopelessness of Odysseus' speech and to the recollection of previous disasters by the *hetairoi*. The *hetairoi* expect that this expedition will go as poorly as the previous two. Odysseus changes a key factor to make this expedition go differently. Now Odysseus leads only half of the *hetairoi*; Eurylochus leads the other. The contrast with the

⁶⁴ *Odyssey* 10.193 εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις· ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶομαι εἶναι (double denial: counterfactual εἴ plus οὐκ οἶομαι).

⁶⁵ This is not because he cares nothing for his *hetairoi*; on the contrary, his *Apologoi* begins when Alkinoos asks him whether he is weeping for a dead *hetairos*, dear as a brother (8.584-586: ἦ τίς που καὶ ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ κεχαρισμένα εἰδώς, / ἐσθλός; ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν τι κασιγνήτοιο χερείων / γίνεται, ὅς κεν ἑταῖρος ἐὼν πεπνυμένα εἰδῇ).

⁶⁶ The epithet is Iliadic but in the *Iliad* modifies only *Akhaioi*. In the *Odyssey*, *euknemides* modifies *Akhaioi* five times and *hetairoi* five times. In the *Iliad*, it modifies *Akhaioi* thirty-one times.

beginning of Book 10 is striking. Whereas previously he let no-one else hold the tiller (*Odyssey* 10.33), now Eurylochus holds command (cf. ἥρχον) over some of Odysseus' "own" *hetairoi* (cf. 10.128). This *hetairos* does not appear before this moment,⁶⁷ but he eventually becomes the central figure in the destruction of Odysseus' last *hetairoi* on Thrinakia.⁶⁸

As it turns out, Odysseus chose a poor co-commander, but Eurylochus' errors mimic Odysseus' in two ways. First, as Odysseus hangs back from the Laestrygonians, so Eurylochus hangs back from Circe while the *hetairoi* enter her house:

ἡ[=Κίρκη] δ' αἶψ' ἐξελθοῦσα θύρας ὤϊξε φαεινὰς

καὶ κάλει· οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἀϊδρεῖσιν ἔποντο·

Εὐρύλοχος δ' ὑπέμεινεν· οἴσατο γὰρ δόλον εἶναι.

(*Odyssey* 10.230-232)

The *hetairoi* now turned into pigs, Eurylochus makes no attempt to rescue them and abandons them, just as Odysseus fled from the Laestrygonian harbor as soon as the giants began to kill his companions. When Eurylochus laments the loss of the *hetairoi* to Odysseus, he proposes not rescue but immediate escape, echoing Odysseus' own words (φεύγωμεν at *Odyssey* 10.269; cf.

⁶⁷ Eurylochus is most naturally included in the group named *hetairoi* on line 203, but he is not named *hetairos* individually. At *Odyssey* 10.441 he is called Odysseus' kinsman by marriage (πηός), but this fact is mentioned in order to magnify Odysseus' anger, not in order to explain the appointment (which occurs more than two hundred lines earlier).

⁶⁸ In his role as a rival *arkhon*, notably but foolishly more sensitive to his companions' suffering than Odysseus, Eurylochus is, with Elpenor, one of only two major exceptions to Finley's otherwise fair description of Odysseus' *hetairoi* as "faceless mediocrities" (1978, 32). For the undifferentiation of both *hetairoi* and suitors see Murnaghan 2001, 49n13.

Odysseus' φύγοιμεν at 10.129). Again like Odysseus in the Laestrogonian harbor, he even suggests subdividing the *hetairoi* into those to be abandoned and those with whom to escape:

μή μ' ἄγε κεῖσ' ἀέκοντα, διοτρεφές, ἀλλὰ λίπ' αὐτοῦ·

οἶδα γὰρ ὥς οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐλεύσεαι οὔτε τιν' ἄλλον

ἄξις σὼν ἐτάρων.⁶⁹ ἀλλὰ ξὺν τοῖσδεσι θᾶσσον

φεύγωμεν· ἔτι γάρ κεν ἀλύξαιμεν κακὸν ἥμαρ.

(*Odyssey* 10.266-269)

To his credit, Odysseus does go to rescue the *hetairoi*, though he does not force Eurylochus to help. But he expresses the decision in curious terms—not of care for companions, but of the burden of command:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εἴμι· κρατερὴ δέ μοι ἔπλετ' ἀνάγκη.

(*Odyssey* 10.273)

Homer's decision to present Odysseus' motivation in terms of “mighty necessity”

(κρατερὴ...ἀνάγκη) suggests a state of mind determined by constraint rather than desire and hope. In this speech, Odysseus has none of the buoyant curiosity and resolute purpose of the inventor of the Trojan horse, the explorer on the Cyclopes' island--or the king returning in secret to evaluate and punish the violators of his household. Moreover, Eurylochus' tactical evaluation is correct, as Hermes himself affirms:

⁶⁹ This phrase perhaps subtly suggests that Eurylochus has abandoned command: ‘your *hetairoi*’ is rather distancing and not spoken by any other member of Odysseus' group.

...ἔταροι δέ τοι οἶδ' ἐνὶ Κίρκης

ἔρχεται ὥς τε σύες πυκινούς κευθμῶνας ἔχοντες.

ἦ τοὺς λυσόμενος δεῦρ' ἔρχεαι; οὐδέ σε φημι

αὐτὸν νοστήσειν, μενέεις δὲ σύ γ' ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι.

(*Odyssey* 10.282-285)

Circe's magical potion is a more powerful weapon than Odysseus' sword. His attempt to rescue his *hetairoi* will result simply in Odysseus losing his *nostos* as well.

If Eurylochus' appointment is the first sign that the *hetairoi* need a different commander, the spontaneous self-appointment of Polites as leader in Eurylochus' absence is a second and less predictable sign that the *hetairoi* are now ready to follow virtually anyone. Just before the *hetairoi* enter Circe's house, Homer introduces Polites with surprising grandeur:

τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε Πολίτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν,

ὅς μοι κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε·

ὦ φίλοι, ἔνδον γάρ τις ἐποιχομένη μέγαν ἰστὸν

καλὸν αἰοιδιάει, δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν ἀμφιμέμυκεν,

ἦ θεὸς ἡ ἐγὼ γυνή· ἀλλὰ φθεγγώμεθα θᾶσσον.

(*Odyssey* 10.224-228)

Polites' impressive introduction belies the fact that this is his first and last appearance in the poem. The character is strange for two reasons. First, if he is indeed the dearest and most trustworthy of Odysseus' *hetairoi* (μοι κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε), we might have

expected Odysseus to choose him to lead half the *hetairoi*, rather than Eurylochos. Odysseus did not choose Polites, but Polites speaks first (ἤρχε) anyway, under the title “leader of men” (ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν). Second, his name is suspicious. Elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, πολίτης appears only in the plural (*Odyssey* 7.131; 17.206) in the phrase ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται, where the phrase helps locate a spring within a polity as a place from which community members draw water.⁷⁰ The oddly named character reinforces the imaginative—and cynical—political discourse that starts with Odysseus’ lonely ship-governance at the beginning of Book 10. The only “community member” in the *Odyssey* is also Odysseus’ “dearest of *hetairoi*,” but the first and last thing he does is to lead the other *hetairoi* into a magical trap.

But the most peculiar feature of the incident on Aiaia is that the very danger Odysseus faces is perpetual solidarity with his *hetairoi* who have been magically turned into swine. Both Hermes and Circe describe the putative effects of Circe’s potion as the union of Odysseus with the “other *hetairoi*” by being turned into a pig as well:

ἔταροι δέ τοι οἶδ’ ἐνὶ Κίρκης...

μενέεις δὲ σύ γ’ ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι.

(Hermes: *Odyssey* 10.282 285)

ἔρχεο νῦν συφεόνδε, μετ’ ἄλλων λέξο ἐταίρων.

(Circe: *Odyssey* 10.320)

⁷⁰ In both passages, the spring is a sign of special favor from gods or heroized ancestors: the spring at *Odyssey* 7.131 is a gift to Alkinoos from the gods; at 17.206, the spring is ‘made’ by the founders of Ithaca and Kephallenia (τὴν ποίησ’ Ἰθακὸς καὶ Νήριτος ἠδὲ Πολύκτωρ). (The *Iliad* includes a minor Trojan prince named Polites, mentioned at 2.791, 13.533, 15.339, and 24.250.)

Read as context for Odysseus' defeat of Circe, these two phrases suggest that Hermes' gift of *moly* (*Odyssey* 10.305) differentiates hero from *hetairoi* in two ways. First, the god's *moly* makes Odysseus invulnerable to the magic that defeated the *hetairoi*. But, second, the *moly* prevents Odysseus from remaining "with" (μετά, ἔνθα) his dehumanized *hetairoi* on Aiaia. Thus Odysseus has a special, salvific bond with the gods, and they keep him from the danger of companionship with sub-human *hetairoi*. The gods have been helping Odysseus since Book 1, but Hermes' gift is the first direct divine contact in narrative time. Odysseus' unique *hetaireia* with the gods will prove essential to his *nostos* and restoration to the throne, but the full flowering of this relationship must await the deaths of his remaining *hetairoi*.⁷¹

2.4 *Hetaireia* against the king: Eurylochus vs. Odysseus

Restoring the *hetairoi* does not revive *hetaireia*. Odysseus' *hetairoi* still do not trust him, and Eurylochus has not quite relinquished command. When Odysseus tells his *hetairoi* to put in on Aiaia and meet their now-rescued *hetairoi* in Circe's house, Eurylochus stops them:

ὥς ἐφάμην, οἱ δ' ὅκα ἐμοῖς' ἐπέεσσι πίθοντο·

Εὐρύλοχος δέ μοι οἶος ἐρύκακε πάντας ἐταίρους

...

ὥς περ Κύκλωψ ἔρξ', ὅτε οἱ μέσσαιον ἵκοντο

ἡμέτεροι ἔταροι, σὺν δ' ὁ θρασὺς εἶπετ' Ὀδυσσεύς·

τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο.

⁷¹ For divine-human *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* see Chapter 4, under "Athena *hetairos*."

(*Odyssey* 10.428-429, 435-437)

The men trust (πίθοντο) Odysseus' words, but apparently their acceptance is not robust: Eurylochus on his own (οἷος) checks the *hetairoi* by pointing out that nothing has changed since they first landed on Aiaia. His speech recalls the very incidents that the *hetairoi* recalled at *Odyssey* 10.198-202, before Odysseus split the group. Crucially, his words also recall the pathetic *hetaireia* of the proem and twist it against Odysseus himself. Eurylochus speaks of how "our *hetairoi*" (ἡμέτεροι ἕταροι) were destroyed by Odysseus' foolishness (τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο; contrast *Odyssey* 1.7, where the *atasthalia* belongs to the *hetairoi* themselves: αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο).⁷² The accusation is supported by the same memories that caused the *hetairoi* to weep when they first landed. In one sentence, Eurylochus sympathizes with the *hetairoi* more than Odysseus, who rejected the utility of weeping (10.202); dismisses any trust that Odysseus might have earned by saving the *hetairoi* from Circe; and subtly presents himself as an alternative to Odysseus with the phrase ἡμέτεροι ἕταροι – a declaration of solidarity with the *hetairoi* that suggests, in context, opposition between the group of *hetairoi* (including Eurylochus) and the Odysseus whose *atasthalia* destroyed them.

Eurylochus' words might seem empty or dismissible as mere narrative prolepsis of the ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο promised in the proem, were Odysseus' reaction not uncharacteristically violent:

ὥς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε μετὰ φρεσὶ μερμήριζα,

⁷² Pucci 1998, 19 cleverly cites the identity of these lines as evidence of Homer's pro-Odyssean bias: the poet exonerates Odysseus from Eurylochus' charge by quoting Eurylochus' charge ten books in advance, then explicitly blaming the *hetairoi* rather than Odysseus for their destruction. The difference may be interpreted contrariwise (perhaps Eurylochus is correcting the proem), but in either case the echo emphasizes the locus of blame for the deaths of the *hetairoi*.

σπασσάμενος τανύηκες ἄορ παχέος παρὰ μηροῦ,

τῷ οἱ ἀποτμήξας κεφαλὴν οὐδ' ἄσδε πελάσσαι...

(*Odyssey* 10.438-440)

The otherwise smooth-talking hero of *metis* has only a sword to offer in argument. Indeed, Odysseus admits that he would simply have killed Eurylochus on the spot, crushing the rebellion before it begins, had the *hetairoi* themselves not restrained him with their own eloquence:

...ἀλλὰ μ' ἐταῖροι

μειλιχίοισ' ἐπέεσσιν ἐρήτυον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος·

διογενές, τοῦτον μὲν ἐάσομεν, εἰ σὺ κελεύεις,

αὐτοῦ παρ νηΐ τε μένειν καὶ νῆα ἔρυσθαι·

ἡμῖν δ' ἡγεμόνευ' ἱερὰ πρὸς δώματα Κίρκης.

(*Odyssey* 10.441-445)

There are now two commanders, by Odysseus' own decree, though Odysseus intended Eurylochus' authority to end once the expedition was over; and the second commander has just raised the question of primary allegiance, countermanding Odysseus' order by appeal to *hetaireia* against him. But the time for Eurylochus' coup is not yet ripe, and the *hetairoi* declare that they will do as Odysseus commands (εἰ σὺ κελεύεις). For the moment, Eurylochus follows Odysseus too – but only because he is afraid.⁷³ Eurylochus' objections, which comprise no more

⁷³ *Odyssey* 10.448: ἀλλ' ἔπετ'· ἔδδεισεν γὰρ ἐμὴν ἔκπαγλον ἐνιπὴν. This is the first time one of Odysseus' men remains silent in fear. Cf. Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, whose seer Calchas remains silent in fear of his enraged king.

than straightforward citations of the destruction Odysseus has brought on his *hetairoi*, stand unrefuted.⁷⁴ Odysseus himself admits this. The danger on Aiaia concludes with Odysseus remarking that he has failed to keep his *hetairoi* safe:

οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' ἔνθεν περ ἀπήμονας ἦγον ἐταίρους.

Ἐλπήνωρ δέ τις ἔσκε νεώτατος...

(*Odyssey* 10.551-552)

As if in a microcosmic coda of Odysseus' failure, Homer follows the silencing of Eurylochus with the story of the death of Elpenor, one of the youngest of the *hetairoi* (*Odyssey* 10.552-560). And in unexpected confirmation of Eurylochus' distrust, Odysseus notes that he has kept something important from the men. They think they are returning to Ithaca; in fact they are now informed that they are heading to Hades (562-565). They weep as they did when they first landed on Aiaia; and, closing the ring of affective separation among hero and *hetairoi*, Odysseus pragmatically and unsympathetically declares their lamentation useless (ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις ἐγίνετο μυρομένοισιν: *Odyssey* 10.558=10.202).

3. Destruction: the road to Thrinakia

By the end of Book 10, the plot promised in the proem is nearly complete. The phrase that describes Odysseus' climactic sorrow—the death of all the *hetairoi*—is uttered near the end of Book 10; but the agent of destruction named in Eurylochus' speech is not the agent named in the proem. *Odyssey* 1.7 promises that all the *hetairoi* will destroy themselves by their own foolishness (αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο). In Book 10, the temporary co-

⁷⁴ Rutherford 1986, 151 nearly agrees with Eurylochus ("there is some truth in what the rebellious Eurylochus says").

commander blames Odysseus for the destruction of some of the *hetairoi* (τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο: 10.437). But the remainder of the *hetairoi* remain alive until Thrinakia, where Odysseus' poor middle-management restructuring backfires catastrophically.

On Thrinakia, the final destruction of the *hetairoi* is linked with *hetaireia* explicitly. Having seized power by appealing to the sufferings of the *hetairoi* (*Odyssey* 12.278-283, 294, 340), Eurylochus leads the men to eat the cattle of the sun. The companions land only by disobeying Odysseus; they eat only when Odysseus wanders away from the camp, “shunning” his *hetairoi* (12.335: ἤλυξα ἐταίρους). Only by a brazen, pretender-led coup, in absolute (if understandable) disobedience to the king, do the *hetairoi* fulfill the promise of the proem.

But three things happen between Aiaia and Thrinakia. Odysseus descends into Hades; the last ship sails past the Sirens with no casualties; and the last ship sails between Scylla and Charybdis with six casualties. Each incident highlights in miniature a different consequence of the dissolution of Iliadic *hetaireia*. The first shows how far Odysseus' adventure has diverged from the *nostos* of his *hetairoi*, who (unlike Odysseus) do not commune with a dead companion whose fondest memory is rowing while alive with his *hetairoi*. The second paints an image of a maximally dysfunctional relationship between hero and *hetairoi*—a king bound with chains and *hetairoi* bound by oath to ignore his commands. The third presents one final heroic effort to protect *hetairoi* by Iliadic military strength—an effort that has absolutely no effect against the monsters of the *Odyssey*, who kill *hetairoi* unavenged. In spite of Odysseus' strength and intelligence, the world of fantasy has made *hetaireia* irrelevant.

3.1 Consequence of failed *hetaireia* I: Elpenor in Hades

Odysseus' *katabasis* does not include any *hetairoi*. They provide necessary support in the realm of the living: two *hetairoi* help Odysseus gain access by holding sheep for him to kill (*Odyssey* 11.23-26); the *hetairoi en masse* flay and sacrifice their corpses (44-46); they must even have been physically present in Hades, since Circe calls them "twice dead" (δισθανέες: 12.22), but they play no part in Odysseus' conversations. Only Odysseus actually communes with the dead. But the shadow of failed *hetaireia* pursues him even into Hades. The shade of Elpenor *hetairos* greets him, first of any shade in Hades, unhappy because nobody has buried his corpse:

πρώτη δὲ ψυχὴ Ἑλπήνορος ἦλθεν ἑταίρου·

οὐ γάρ πω ἐτέθαπτο ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης

(*Odyssey* 11.51-52)

Elpenor closes his speech with a request to be buried in his armor with a memento of *hetaireia* – the oar, the implement with which he lived and rowed with "my *hetairoi*":

ταῦτά τέ μοι τελέσαι πῆξαί τ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἔρετμόν,

τῷ καὶ ζωὸς ἔρεσσον ἐὼν μετ' ἐμοῖς ἑτάροισιν.

(*Odyssey* 11.77-78)

The oar is the sign of living with *hetairoi*.⁷⁵ The characteristic action of these *hetairoi* is to row, not to fight (as in the *Iliad*). Elpenor wishes to be remembered as if in the same boat with his *hetairoi*. To this Odysseus offers no rejoinder. Following Odysseus' uncharacteristically terse

⁷⁵ According to Teiresias' prophecy, which immediately follows the conversation with Elpenor and contains the refrain 'ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἑταίρους' (*Odyssey* 11.114), Odysseus will die among men who know nothing of the oar (127-137). For rower-*hetairoi* see Chapter 4, under "The new *hetairoi*: sailors, suitors, steward, and slaves."

reply (*Odyssey* 11.80: ταῦτά τοι, ὦ δύστηνε, τελευτήσω τε καὶ ἔρξω), the poet ends the conversation with a complex encapsulation of Odysseus' broken *hetaireia*—the pathetic image of the death-conquering hero with impotently bloodied sword conversing with the shade of his *hetairos*:

νῶϊ μὲν ὥς ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβομένῳ στυγεροῖσιν

ἤμεθ', ἐγὼ μὲν ἄνευθεν ἐφ' αἵματι φάσγανον ἴσχων,

εἶδωλον δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐταίρου πόλλ' ἀγόρευεν.

(*Odyssey* 11.81-83)

The sword has killed, but not enemies. The function of the blood is magical, not military, and portends neither good nor evil for his *hetairos*. The hero is in the underworld but, paradoxically, not dead, while the interlocutor shade-*hetairos* is dead prematurely, his body abandoned by his king. The *eidolon* of the youngest *hetairos* is “on the other side” (ἐτέρωθεν), set apart from Odysseus by death. The contrast with the obvious Iliadic comparandum (*Iliad* 23.65-107) is sharp. Where Patroclus' shade deliberately ventures into a living Achilles' dream in order to ask him for burial, Odysseus' living body enters the world of the dead and unexpectedly encounters the shade of an unburied *hetairos*. While Patroclus' shade seeks his body's burial in order to enter Hades (*Iliad* 23.71), Elpenor's shade asks Odysseus to bury his corpse in order to join him again with his rower-*hetairoi*. The *Odyssey* encounter ends with speech (ἀγόρευεν) between two separated individuals (ἐτέρωθεν); the *Iliad* encounter ends with Achilles' attempt at physical contact, thwarted only by the incorporeality of the dead (*Iliad* 23.99-107). Elpenor's death is not Odysseus' fault, but Elpenor's shade treats Odysseus mainly as a commander, while Patroclus' shade treats Achilles only as a companion.

3.2 Consequence of failed *hetaireia* II: curious Odysseus bound by deafened *hetairoi*

Final confirmation of the end of *hetaireia* comes in the two episodes between Hades and Thrinakia. First, the successful tactic against the Sirens dramatizes the tension between personal curiosity and military command—a final assertion of the contradiction between Odysseus’ personality and the Iliadic type of warrior-companionship.⁷⁶ Second, Odysseus’ ineffective tactic against Scylla demonstrates the powerlessness of human military prowess—a final rejection of merely mortal force in the monstrous world of the *Odyssey*.

One peculiar hint of post-human *hetaireia* appears during the second departure from Aiaia. Already in Circe’s prophecy (*Odyssey* 12.36-141), the final dash from Aiaia to Thrinakia is marked by headlong speed: the avoidance of permanent arrest by the rocks at the Sirens’ shore; the counterfactual burst through the Planctae, a route rejected because no ship can move as quickly as the Argo; the death-doubling danger of dallying to fight Scylla, whom human strength cannot defeat.⁷⁷ Apparently the rower-*hetairoi* cannot generate enough speed to combat these dangers, for Circe sends a magical *hetairos* to power the journey:

ἡμῖν δ’ αὖ κατόπισθε νεὸς κυανοπρώροιο

ἵκμενον οὖρον ἵει πλησίστιον, ἐσθλὸν ἑταῖρον,

Κίρκη εὐπλόκαμος, δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήεσσα.

⁷⁶ For the Sirens’ song as a temptation to Iliadic heroism, sung in voices claiming Muse-like authority, see Reinhardt 1948, 60-62; Fränkel 1962, 10-11; Gresseth 1970; Pucci 1979; Segal 1983, 38-43; Doherty 1995; Cook 1999, 161-62.

⁷⁷ She delivers the prophecy to Odysseus after taking him “apart from his *hetairoi*” (ἐλοῦσα φίλων ἀπονόσφιν ἑταίρων: *Odyssey* 12.33); cf. Theoclymenos taking Telemachus apart from his *hetairoi* (ἐτάρων ἀπονόσφι καλέσας; discussed in Chapter 4, under “Telemachus’ ephemeral sailor-*hetairoi*”).

(*Odyssey* 12.148-150)

Here the wind gives the aid Odysseus needs; therefore the wind is here called *hetairos*. The *Odyssey* poet pairs the *hetairos*-wind with an unnamed human *kubernetes* to reverse the image that begins Book 10:

τὴν δ' ἄνεμός τε κυβερνήτης τ' ἴθυνε.

(*Odyssey* 12.152); versus

αἰεὶ γὰρ πόδα νηὸς ἐνώμων, οὐδέ τω ἄλλω

δῶχ' ἐτάρων, ἵνα θᾶσσον ἰκοίμεθα πατρίδα γαῖαν.

(*Odyssey* 10.32-33)

With wind as a straight-blowing *hetairos*, Odysseus need not fear giving the rudder to anyone else among the *hetairoi*.

The magical wind-*hetairos* does nothing to improve the state of human *hetaireia*. If the conversation with Elpenor's shade encapsulates the *pathos* of broken *hetaireia*, the encounter with the Sirens sharpens to the point of reversal the relation between commander and *hetairoi*. Insofar as no human can resist the Sirens' song, it is not the fault of the *hetairoi* that they cannot be trusted to row past with their ears open. But Odysseus knows that he must restrict what his *hetairoi* know in order to satisfy his own curiosity.⁷⁸ He also knows that his *hetairoi* do not trust him to keep them safe. His plan to survive the Sirens allows him simultaneously to satisfy his curiosity and assuage his *hetairoi*'s fear that they will die under Odysseus' risk-prone leadership.

⁷⁸ For the Sirens' song as temptation to immortality see Stanford 1955, 76; Taylor 1963, 91-95; Hogan 1976, 197-199.

But his plan works at the continued expense of *hetaireia* itself. Odysseus promises to tell everyone the things Circe told him (*Odyssey* 12.153-157), but he tells them only about the Sirens. Then he actually makes his *hetairoi* promise to disobey him:

εἰ δέ κε λίσσωμαι ὑμέας λῦσαί τε κελεύω,

ὑμεῖς δὲ πλεόνεσσι τότ' ἐν δεσμοῖσι πιέζειν.

ἦ τοι ἐγὼ τὰ ἕκαστα λέγων ἐτάροισι πίφαισκον...

(*Odyssey* 12.162-164)

The divergence of Odysseus' self-interest and the safety of his *hetairoi*, evident since the Cyclopes' island, distills into the paradox of a command not to obey (εἰ δέ κε λίσσωμαι ὑμέας λῦσαί τε κελεύω... ὑμεῖς δὲ πλεόνεσσι τότ' ἐν δεσμοῖσι πιέζειν). Odysseus contrives to indulge a personal curiosity that would have destroyed the entire expedition, if the well-instructed *hetairoi* had not obeyed him by ignoring his pleas and commands.⁷⁹

3.3 Consequence of failed *hetaireia* III: the last impotent warrior-*hetaireia* against Scylla

The final incident before Thrinakia, the passage between Scylla and Charybdis, poses a paradigmatically insoluble problem that reveals a profoundly post-Iliadic feature of Odyssean *hetaireia*. On the one hand, the whirlpool threatens the whole group; on the other, Scylla threatens only as many men as her six heads can catch at once. When Odysseus desperately

⁷⁹ But again the world of wonders makes any other course of action impossible: only deaf *hetairoi* can sail past the Sirens safely. Odysseus emphasizes the need to disobey him even if he both begs and commands (εἰ δέ κε λίσσωμαι ὑμέας λῦσαί τε κελεύω). He cannot restrain his desire to know; rather, the *hetairoi* must restrain him by force (πλεόνεσσι τότ' ἐν δεσμοῖσι). The ship passes the Sirens only because the bound hero gains knowledge while the unbound *hetairoi* remain ignorant: the *hetairoi* never hear the Sirens' promise of knowledge. They row ship safely past because they pay no attention to the command of a curiosity-beguiled Odysseus that contradicts the command of an Odysseus instructed by a goddess.

hopes he might pass through without losing any *hetairoi*,⁸⁰ Circe rebukes him for foolishly imagining that the journey is a war and tells him not to fight Scylla, because to arm and fight would give Scylla enough time to eat six more (*Odyssey* 12.120-124).⁸¹ The conversation marks the passage from Iliadic to Odyssean *hetaireia*.⁸² Circe's words introduce a calculus of collective benefit that has no place in heroic companionship. In the *Iliad*, the deaths of *hetairoi* are unacceptable. In the *Odyssey*, it is necessary to sacrifice a few *hetairoi* for the safety of the entire group.

The king's new pragmatism leads to another expression of understandable distrust for *hetairoi*. As Odysseus trusts his *hetairoi* too little to let them hear the Sirens, so he trusts their courage too little tell them about Scylla:

Σκύλλην δ' οὐκέτ' ἐμυθεόμην, ἄπρηκτον ἀνίην,

μή πώς μοι δείσαντες ἀπολλήξειαν ἑταῖροι

εἰρεσίης, ἐντὸς δὲ πυκάζοιεν σφέας αὐτούς.

(*Odyssey* 12.223-225)

Odysseus deceives for the sake of speed, knowing all too well that his *hetairoi* cannot endure what only a hero can face. He is afraid lest their fear should drive them to stop rowing and form a protective huddle (ἐντὸς δὲ πυκάζοιεν). The imagined body language of the *hetairoi* expresses

⁸⁰ *Odyssey* 12.112-114: εἰ δ' ἄγε δὴ μοι τοῦτο, θεά, νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες, / εἴ πως τὴν ὀλοὴν μὲν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι Χάρυβδιν, / τὴν δέ κ' ἀμυναίμην, ὅτε μοι σίνοντο γ' ἑταίρους.

⁸¹ *Odyssey* 12.116: σχέτλιε, καὶ δὴ αὖ τοι πολεμήϊα ἔργα μέμηλε – only a fool would confuse the world of the *Iliad* with the world of Scylla and Charybdis.

⁸² For Odysseus' attempt to fight Scylla as the habitual (but now ineffectual) response of an Iliadic warrior to an inescapable enemy see Reinhardt 1948, 70; Whitman 1958, 300; Segal 1983, 27; Heubeck 1989, *ad loc*; Hopman 2012, 14-16 and 2013, 28-30.

the psychological state of a group of helpless victims. Odysseus wishes to give them confidence to propel the boat by rowing – an individual choice that presupposes collective activity and therefore mutual trust in a common, energetic commitment to aggressive forward movement. If they are afraid, then they cannot row because they do not expect to move forward. They will remain concerned for one another, but the expression of their concern will be defensive, immobile, and closed inwards (ἐντός).

Contrary to Circe's command, Odysseus does arm himself against Scylla. In accord with Circe's prophecy, his weapons are powerless against the monster's first assault. Scylla plucks six *hetairoi* from the ship, and—the knife of *pathos* twisted again—they happen to be the best:

τόφρα δέ μοι Σκύλλη γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς **ἐταίρους**

ἔξ ἔλεθ', οἳ **χερσίν** τε βίηφί τε **φέρτατοι** ἦσαν.

σκεψάμενος δ' ἐς νῆα θοὴν **ἄμα καὶ μεθ' ἐταίρους**

ἦδη τῶν ἐνόησα πόδας καὶ **χεῖρας ὕπερθεν**

ὕψος' ἀειρομένων· ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες

ἔξονομακλήδην, τότε γ' ὕστατον, ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ.

(*Odyssey* 12.245-246)

Odysseus sees the six mighty *hetairoi* struggling in Scylla's mouths like fish on a line (251-254), crying out to him by name.⁸³ For all his military strength, he can only look on while the *hetairoi*

⁸³ *Odyssey* 12.249-250: ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες / ἔξονομακλήδην.

are killed.⁸⁴ That in which these *hetairoi* were strong (χερσίν τε βίηφί τε φέρτατοι) becomes a ghastly sign of their helplessness (χεῖρας ὑπερθεν) against an inhuman terror. This is the most pitiable of all the sorrows the hero has suffered on the sea.⁸⁵

3.4 From dissention to death: Eurylochus and the *hetairoi* destroy themselves

The last gasp of Iliadic warrior prowess having failed to protect the *hetairoi*, Odysseus' ship proceeds at last to Thrinakia. Here the surviving *hetairoi* deliver on the promise of the proem.⁸⁶ The last incident in the dissolution of *hetaireia* is the self-destruction of the *hetairoi* by their own *atasthalia*. All the earlier failures of *hetaireia* come together on Thrinakia. Odysseus' *hetairoi* do not trust him, so they ignore his commands. They follow Eurylochus instead, who wins their assent by describing the gulf that separates the superhuman hero from his comparatively weak *hetairoi*. Odysseus does not trust his *hetairoi*, despite their oath not to eat the cattle, so he avoids them after landfall. While Odysseus is alone and asleep, separated from his *hetairoi*, Eurylochus appeals to *hetaireia* in order to persuade the *hetairoi* to break their oath. The narrative is dense with *heta(i)r*- words—all at key moments in the spiral toward final destruction, all signifying the separation of Odysseus from his companions.

As the ship comes within earshot of the sacred cattle, Odysseus tries desperately to avoid the island by appealing to *hetaireia* one last time:

⁸⁴ Contrary to Circe's fear, Odysseus' arming does not delay the ship enough to give Scylla access to six more *hetairoi*.

⁸⁵ This is Odysseus' own perspective (*Odyssey* 12.258-259): οἰκτιστον δὴ κείνο ἐμοῖς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι / πάντων, ὅσσ' ἐμόγησα πόρους ἄλως ἐξερεείνων.

⁸⁶ For Thrinakia and the proem see especially Cook 2006, 111-128 (disagreeing particularly with Fenik 1974, 213ff) and discussion of proem in chapter 4 below. For the responsibility of the *hetairoi* (and exoneration of Odysseus) see Schadewaldt 1960, 856-866; Friedrich 1987 (strongly rejecting Eurylochus' argument); Segal 1994, 215-220. For the seriousness of the offense see Vernant 1979, 243-248.

δὴ τότε ἔγὼν **ἐτάροισι μετηύδων** ἀχνύμενος κῆρ·

κέκλυτέ μευ μύθων, **κακά περ πάσχοντες ἐταῖροι...**

(*Odyssey* 12.270-271)

Odysseus' opening words here are identical to the words he (perhaps) speaks on landfall on Aiaia (*Odyssey* 12.271=10.190), but here they are certainly not spurious because the speech contains no other greeting. The emphatic, perhaps concessive *πέρ* again suggests that there is some tension between listening to Odysseus and having suffered so many evils. He asks them to listen to his words “even though” they have suffered so much. He knows he is asking a lot, but he backs up the difficult command by appeal to prophecies from both Teiresias and Circe—implying that he knows he lacks the authority to force the *hetairoi* not to land the ship.

The *hetairoi* weep as they did on Aiaia (*Odyssey* 12.287: τοῖσιν δὲ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ). But where on Aiaia Odysseus responded by splitting the group between himself and Eurylochus, here on Thrinakia Eurylochus effectively takes command by appealing to the discontent of the *hetairoi*:

αὐτίκα δ' Εὐρύλοχος στυγερῶ μ' ἠμείβετο μύθῳ·

σχέτλιός εἰς, Ὀδυσεῦ, περί τοι μένος, οὐδέ τι γυῖα

κάμνεις· ἦ ῥά νυ σοί γε σιδήρεα πάντα τέτυκται,

ὅς ῥ' ἐτάρους καμάτῳ ἀδηκότας ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνῳ

οὐκ ἑάας γαίης ἐπιβήμεναι, ἔνθα κεν αὖτε

νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον...

ὥς ἔφατ' Εὐρύλοχος, ἐπὶ δ' ἦνεον ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι.

(*Odyssey* 12.278-283, 294)

Odysseus is to blame (σχέτλιος) for driving the *hetairoi* too hard. He is not like his *hetairoi*: they are filled with weariness (καμάτῳ ἀδηκότας) while he is exceedingly strong (περί τοι μένος). Eurylochus speaks at an opportune moment. Three incidents since Aiaia have confirmed that Odysseus has the strength to do what his *hetairoi* do not. But the journey since the Lotus-Eaters has proved the same thing over and over. It is no empty rhetorical ploy to place the hero and the *hetairoi* in separate worlds, with different degrees of endurance, and therefore at odds in moments of extreme duress. Eurylochus merely summarizes what has come to be since the departure from Troy.⁸⁷

The facts of the case are on Eurylochus' side, and the sailors know it.⁸⁸ The *hetairoi* had remained obedient to Odysseus when Eurylochus first countermanded Odysseus' order (*Odyssey* 10.429-437), but this time they approve of Eurylochus' words (ἦνεον ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι). The coup of the recently-minted lieutenant succeeds. But the *hetairoi* have acted against Odysseus' will before—on the island of the Lotus-Eaters, where Odysseus had to force each lotus-eating *hetairos* back to the ship. The difference now is that, while each lotus-eating *hetairos* acted alone and without a leader, here in Book 12 all the *hetairoi* are acting together with Eurylochus as leader.

⁸⁷ Friedrich 1987, 393- 397 reads the Thrinakia episode as an illustration of the virtue of *tlemosyne*, which Odysseus possesses as the rest of the *hetairoi* do not (just as Eurylochus says).

⁸⁸ In my interpretation, the *hetairoi* agree with Eurylochus not because they assent to his nautical reasoning but rather because they agree that Odysseus has harmed them in the past. Eurylochus' argument is thus basically ethical in Aristotle's sense. For a nautical defense of Eurylochus' speech (on the grounds that night sailing is dangerous) see Fenik 1974, 213; for the counter-point that ships in the *Odyssey* regularly sail at night see Cook 1995, 114-115 (although the journeys cited are not without incident).

The tactics of the situation are post-Iliadic. Numbers matter here, as they have not before mattered in either Homeric poem.⁸⁹ In the *Iliad*, the actions of individual heroes determine the victory. But here on Thrinakia the hero cannot overcome a crew of *hetairoi* united against him. Odysseus makes the principle explicit as he accuses Eurylochus of overpowering him with numbers:

Εὐρύλοχ', ἧ μάλα δὴ με βιάζεστε μοῦνον ἐόντα⁹⁰

(*Odyssey* 12.297)

The pretender's name proves prophetic: "Broad-troop" has turned the *hetairoi* into a mob. Odysseus is no longer in control, but he does manage to extract an oath from them: they will stay the night but will not kill any herd animal on the island. The men so swear (οἱ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀπώμνουν ὡς ἐκέλευον: 304). They reject Odysseus' leadership but do not entirely deny his *metis*. But the oath is Odysseus' last card to play. As his weapons could not keep Scylla from the *hetairoi*, so his heroic prowess can do nothing to save the *hetairoi* from their own foolishness. On Aiaia, he hunted for the sake of his hungry *hetairoi* and briefly raised their spirits with a meal. But on Thrinakia, when the supplies run out and everyone begins to starve, Odysseus does not go hunting, because the prophecy tells him that no food is available, but rather goes off on his own to pray. In a remarkable phrase, he "shuns" his *hetairoi* and the gods put him to sleep.⁹¹

⁸⁹ The theme of strength in numbers, and in particular of Odysseus the one set against the *hetairoi* (sailors or suitors) the many, is of course central to the restoration of the king on Ithaca. Chapter 4 discusses the theme more fully.

⁹⁰ This phrase is recalled when Odysseus fears the suitors' numbers at *Odyssey* 20.30: μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσι. In book 20, Athena can rightly blame Odysseus for his fear, because Athena herself is on Odysseus' side. But here on Thrinakia no god offers Odysseus support, despite his prayers. In this purely human, post-Iliadic world – until the gods side with the king – the mass trumps the individual.

⁹¹ For the significance of divinely-given sleep see Bona 1966, 21-23.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ διὰ νήσου ἰὼν ἤλυξα ἐταίρους,
χεῖρας νιψάμενος, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο,
ἡρώμην πάντεσσι θεοῖσ', οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν·
οἱ δ' ἄρα μοι γλυκὺν ὕπνον ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔχευαν.⁹²

(*Odyssey* 12.335-338)

This is the only time anyone “shuns” (ἀλυσκάζω) *hetairoi* in Homer. The sense of avoidance encoded in ἀλυσκάζω is strong. In Homer, the most common object of ἀλυσκάζω is death (θάνατος, κῆρ, ὄλεθρον).⁹³ The connotation is accurate in this context. By “shunning” his *hetairoi*, Odysseus avoids the destruction they bring on themselves. The hero survives only because the separation between himself and his *hetairoi* is as absolute as the separation between life and death.⁹⁴

The only remaining *hetaireia* obtains only between usurper and *hetairoi*. While the king shuns his *hetairoi* and sleeps, the usurping commander takes charge with an appeal to *hetaireia* that directly quotes Odysseus' last speech:

Εὐρύλοχος δ' ἐτάροισι κακῆς ἐξήρχετο βουλῆς·
κέκλυτέ μευ μύθων, κακά περ πάσχοντες ἐταῖροι...

(*Odyssey* 12.339-340)

⁹² Cf. the other catastrophic council of *hetairoi*, held while Odysseus is asleep, at *Odyssey* 10.31.

⁹³ Cf. *Iliad* 10.371; 11.451; 12.113, 327; 15.287; 21.565; *Odyssey* 2.352; 4.512; 5.387; 10.269; 11.113; 12.1140, 216; 17.547; 19.558; 22.66, 363, 382, 330; 23.336.

⁹⁴ For Thrinakia as inversion of the Cyclops' cave see Cook 1995, chapter 4.

Insofar as he appeals to the “*hetairoi* having suffered much,” Eurylochus resembles Odysseus during the approach to Thrinakia.⁹⁵ But insofar as he leads the *hetairoi* with an “evil counsel” (κακῆς...βουλῆς), Eurylochus resembles the *hetairoi* when they decided to open the bag of the winds (*Odyssey* 10.46: βουλὴ δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἑταίρων). Eurylochus combines Odysseus’ authority with the *nostos*-destroying foolishness of the *hetairoi*. The *hetairoi* approve in a phrase (ἐπὶ δ’ ἦνεον ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι) that appears only twice in Homer: first, when the *hetairoi* approve Eurylochus’ plan to land on Thrinakia (12.294); and second, when the *hetairoi* approve Eurylochus’ suggestion that they eat the cattle of the sun (352).

The self-destructive decision made, all that remains is that the consequences of the *atasthalia* unfold. Keeping the promise of the proem, the narrative of post-*atasthalia* fallout is rich with references to *hetaireia*. Over the next forty lines, the *heta(i)r-* root recurs three times as divine vengeance approaches:⁹⁶

οἱ δ’ ἔταροι μέγα ἔργον ἐμητίσαντο μένοντες

(*Odyssey* 12.373: Odysseus accusing Zeus of cruelty)

τεῖσαι δὴ ἐτάρους Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος

(*Odyssey* 12.378: Helios demanding vengeance from Zeus)

ἐξῆμαρ μὲν ἔπειτα **ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι**

⁹⁵ Friedrich 1987, 391 argues that the *hetairoi* were not starving, but this matters only from a moral perspective; the psychology is presented clearly however imminent or remote starvation actually was. The decision to eat the cattle is consistent with the exhaustion demonstrated by their decision to put in at Thrinakia in the first place.

⁹⁶ For repetition as emphasis in the Thrinakia episode see Cook 1995, 116. For the distinction between the fate of Odysseus and that of his *hetairoi* in this scene see Haubold 2000, 135-136.

δαίνυντ' Ἡελίοιο βοῶν ἐλόωντες ἀρίστας

(*Odyssey* 12.397-398: Odysseus' *hetairoi* ignoring his rebuke)

In narrative time, this is the last appearance of the key Iliadic phrase ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι. The modifier is now ironic. After this incident, *hetairoi* are “trusty” no longer.⁹⁷

The final destruction of the *hetairoi* comes in an image that shatters the quasi-political image first painted at the beginning of Book 10. Zeus' hurricane smashes the mast into the steersman's skull (ὁ δ' ἄρα πρυμνῇ ἐνὶ νηϊ / πλῆξε κυβερνήτεω κεφαλὴν: *Odyssey* 12.412). The ship is without *kubernetes* as the *kubernetes*' head is crushed. The last *hetairoi* die at the hands of both Zeus and Poseidon, driven by a thunderbolt into the sea.⁹⁸

Ζεὺς δ' ἄμυδις βρόντησε καὶ ἔμβαλε νηὶ κεραυνόν·

ἢ δ' ἐλελίχθη πᾶσα Διὸς πληγεῖσα κεραυνῶ,

ἐν δὲ θεοῖου πλῆτο· **πέσον δ' ἐκ νηὸς ἑταῖροι.**

οἱ δὲ κορώνησιν ἵκελοι περὶ νῆα μέλαιναν

κύμασιν ἐμφορέοντο, θεὸς δ' ἀποαίνυτο νόστον.

(*Odyssey* 12.415-419)

⁹⁷ Nor are they ‘lovely’, ‘closely fitted’, ‘beneficial’, nor any other sense of ἐρίηρος discussed in Chapter 1, under “Descriptors.” For the “erosion” of *erieros hetairos* in the *Odyssey* see Roisman 1984, 22n27.

⁹⁸ Zeus is named and Poseidon is not, but most of the *hetairoi* die by drowning. For the significance of the fact that Zeus, not Helios, drives the *hetairoi* into the sea see Cook 1995, 121-127.

The last *hetairoi* die by falling from the ship. They bob in the waves “κορώνησιν ἵκελοι”—like puffins, bow-tips, ship-sterns, embryos, crows, or crowns. The promise of the poem is fulfilled: the god denies their homecoming.⁹⁹

* * *

Summary and conclusions: the breakdown of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* as a response to the dominance of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*

The first half of the *Odyssey* begins with Odysseus on Ogygia and ends with Odysseus on his way there. The intervening books show how Odysseus came from victory against Troy to captivity under Calypso; how his warrior-band dwindled from many ships to one and finally to no *hetairoi* at all; and how, between Troy and Ogygia, the king lost the trust of his companions and the companions lost the trust of their king. At the end of *Odyssey* 12, Odysseus has hardly anything in common with any Iliadic *basileus*.

By the time the Phaeacians send him to Ithaca, Odysseus has left every aspect of *hetaireia* behind. The narrative shows very precisely how this occurs. This chapter has already treated the specific actions that dissolve the warrior-companionship of the *Iliad*. The following pages consider how each of the four specific means whereby Homer brings about the destruction of Odysseus’ *hetairoi* dismantles a different key feature of Iliadic *hetaireia*.

1. Self-direction dismantled: the self-destruction of the *hetairoi*

Odysseus’ sufferings climax in something that could not have happened in the *Iliad*: in the *Odyssey*, the *hetairoi* destroy themselves (*Odyssey* 1.7: αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν

⁹⁹ The proem promises ‘ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ’ (*Odyssey* 1.9) and fulfilment is ‘θεὸς δ’ ἀποαίνυτο νόστον’ (12.419). ἀφαιρέω describes taking-away as movement; ἀπαίνυμαι describes taking-away as refusal.

ὄλοντο). But this middle-voice self-destruction is only the cap-stone of a long sequence of less active resistances to homecoming. Until Thrinakia, they do not direct their actions homeward or control the results of their actions. The *hetairoi* are at their most active and self-directed when they open the bag of the winds, suspecting Odysseus of treachery; but the effects that they did not foresee and cannot control are catastrophic. Usually they cannot even bring themselves to do something foolish; indeed, sheer lassitude is the occasion of their first rescue. When they forget about *nostos* after eating lotus-fruit, Odysseus must force them back to the ships. On the island of the Cyclopes, the *hetairoi* are eaten helplessly until Odysseus directs them to sharpen the stake and drive it into Polyphemus' eye; and only Odysseus is not passively tied to the belly of a sheep. Even on Thrinakia they do not eat the cattle of the sun until Eurylochus tells them to do so. Thus in the *Odyssey*, the *hetairoi* lack both internal fire and self-direction. The notion of the commander as sole controller and director of *hetairoi* is expressed vividly by the image of Odysseus constantly holding the tiller and giving it to none of the *hetairoi* (*Odyssey* 10.53).

The *hetairoi* of the *Iliad* could not be more different. In the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* are entirely self-motivated and self-directed. The hero need only feed the internal fire that already drives nearby warriors to fight. No Iliadic *hetairoi* are reluctant to enter battle; in fact, only when the commander is actually preventing *hetairoi* from fighting are *hetairoi* ever called “unwilling” (*Iliad* 16.204).¹⁰⁰ Warriors regularly stir one another to battle-fury even when no individual hero is clearly leading them in battle.

Thus, according to Iliadic *hetaireia*, warriors need not be protected from their own folly. But according to Odyssean *hetaireia*, warriors without a *kubernetes* will destroy themselves.

¹⁰⁰ See discussion in Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

2. Mutual benefit inverted: the increase of mutual destructiveness of *hetaireia*

The relation between hero and *hetairoi* must be different depending on whether the *hetairoi* are passive and self-destructive, on the one hand, or active and self-directed, on the other. In the former case, the bond of *hetaireia* is either a burden to the successful hero, insofar as the *hetairoi* either need to be dragged along (sometimes literally) or actively opposed. In the latter case, the *hetairoi* not only propel themselves forward, but also, in virtue of their bond with the hero, give even the hero considerable strength. The former is the situation of the *Odyssey*; the latter of the *Iliad*. In the *Iliad*, hero and *hetairoi* strengthen one another. When *hetairoi* are in danger, heroes rescue them; when heroes are overwhelmed, *hetairoi* offer them safety. The *ethnos hetairon* successfully protects the retreating hero in all cases but one—the death of Patroclus, a deliberately composed exception, involving heavy divine intervention, that has poetic effect as a shocking anomaly. Heroes successfully encourage *hetairoi* in battle, and *hetairoi* give *tharsos* to beleaguered heroes. Hector is blamed for leading *hetairoi* to destruction (*Iliad* 13.780), but *hetairoi* are never blamed for the destruction of nearby heroes.¹⁰¹

But in the *Odyssey*, hero and *hetairoi* drag one another down. Odysseus' *hetairoi* ruin everyone's *nostos* – within sight of Ithaca – by opening the bag of the winds; but only because their *hetaireia* is already toxic, because they believe Odysseus is trying to keep spoils from them. Odysseus rescues his *hetairoi* from the lotus, from Circe, and from Polyphemos; but hero and *hetairoi* are in the Cyclops' cave only because Odysseus led them there, against their advice, to satisfy his own curiosity. Even the foolish decision of the *hetairoi* to follow Eurylochus, who had

¹⁰¹ The only partial exception is Achilles, who blames himself for Patroclus' death. But the case of Achilles and Patroclus is also the only case of mutual *hetaireia* (where Achilles is *hetairos* of Patroclus and Patroclus is *hetairos* of Achilles).

already proved himself a poor leader outside Circe's palace, depends on their resentment of Odysseus' earlier commands (σχέτλιός εἰς, Ὀδυσσεῦ... ὅς ῥ' ἐτάρους καμάτῳ ἀδηκότας; *Odyssey* 12.278, 280). As this poisonous *hetaireia* kept Odysseus from home for years after his first sight of the Ithacan shores, so the same destructive relationship led his *hetairoi* to destroy themselves by eating the cattle of the sun.

Thus according to Iliadic *hetaireia*, heroes and their warrior-companions are paradigmatically good for one another; but according to Odyssean *hetaireia*, heroes and their warrior-companions, faced with superhuman terrors, are catastrophically bad for one another.

3. *Peith/pist-* redefined: the cumulate breakdown of trust between hero and *hetairoi*

The most thematically – and lexically – distinctive feature of Iliadic *hetaireia* is trust even to the point of death.¹⁰² Odysseus' *hetairoi* leave him for the unproven commander Eurylochus because Odysseus' decisions have earned their distrust, but Odysseus' *hetairoi* have earned his distrust as well. Each disaster in Odysseus' journey from Troy to Scheria constitutes a new stage in the breakdown of trust between hero and *hetairoi*. After the Lotus-Eaters, Odysseus cannot trust his *hetairoi* to return home. After the expedition into the Cyclops' cave, magnified by Odysseus' gratuitous and catastrophic self-affirmation during the retreat from the island, the *hetairoi* open the bag of the winds because they no longer trust Odysseus' leadership, and this decision takes away their homecoming. After this disaster, Odysseus sends an expedition of *hetairoi* among the Laestrygonians, and all but his own ship's *hetairoi* are killed. The same image

¹⁰² For the lexical and thematic complex linking *peith-/pist-*, *heta(i)r-*, and death, see discussion under “The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*” in Chapter 1.

that encapsulates Odysseus' absolute control also expresses his total distrust: he will not give the tiller to any of the *hetairoi* (*Odyssey* 10.53).

The universal trustworthiness among hero and *hetairoi* in the *Iliad* casts the breakdown of trust in the *Odyssey* into high relief. In addition to the lexical association of *pistos*, *hetairos*, and death, the consistent actions of heroes and *hetairoi* prove that both can be relied upon in any situation. On the battlefield, nothing motivates warriors to kill, die, or risk their lives in battle nearly as much as *hetaireia*. Never does a hero fail to respond to *hetairoi* in need—except for Hector, whose failures to protect or avenge *hetairoi* culminate in his failure to trust the good advice of his *hetairos* Poulydamas—advice which, at least momentarily, would have saved him from Achilles' wrath. Never do *hetairoi* fail to protect a threatened hero—except for Patroclus, whose retreat into the *ethnos hetairon* ought to save him, but the poetic force of Hector's assault depends precisely on the elsewhere justified expectation that the *ethnos hetairon* will successfully protect their hero. So trustworthy is *hetaireia* that the poet encodes reliability at a semantic level: *heta(i)r-* root is not even applied to a warrior unless he is actually offering or receiving affection or support.

Thus, according to Iliadic *hetaireia*, heroes and warrior-companions deserve one another's deepest trust, but according to Odyssean *hetaireia*, heroes and warrior-companions deserve one another's deepest distrust, for the one partner in *hetaireia* is the cause of the other's failure to return home.

4. Solidarity lost: the overthrow of Odysseus by his *hetairoi*

When trust is gone, cohesion breaks down, and command disappears altogether.¹⁰³ One major indicator that, in the *Iliad*, heroes and *hetairoi* do always trust one another is that warriors never consider overthrowing their commander. Even when Achilles' withdrawal from battle keeps his *hetairoi* from fighting, contrary to what they will (ὄς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἔχεις ἄέκοντας ἑταίρους: *Iliad* 16.204), they remain loyal to his leadership, and he openly blames himself for acting against their martial desires as he unleashes them into battle under the command of Patroclus *hetairos*. The only warrior to disobey his superior is Achilles; but this happens only after Agamemnon sets "your *hetairoi*" against "my *hetairoi*," and even Achilles' desire to kill Agamemnon is a response to purely personal dishonor, with no desire to replace him as supreme *wanax*.

Compared to the *Iliad*, the relation between commander and commanded in the *Odyssey* could not be more different. Odysseus proves a poor military commander since the Ciconian counterattack; he proves a selfish and untrustworthy leader on the Cyclopes' island; and eventually his *hetairoi* reject him in favor of another *arkhegos*. No personal insult has split commander and warriors apart; nor does the overthrown commander blame himself for failing to listen to the will of his *hetairoi* when they join themselves under another's rule. But the result of the coup is catastrophic. Eurylochus gives the *hetairoi* what they want, offering them food to satisfy their extreme hunger; but his food comprises the sacred cattle of the sun, and as a derivative consequence of Eurylochus' leadership the Sun persuades Zeus to inflict vengeance on Odysseus *hetairoi* (τεῖσαι δὴ ἐτάρους Λαερτιάδew Ὀδυσῆος: *Odyssey* 12.378).

¹⁰³ This is true in modern military groups no less than in the *Odyssey*: see Shay 2002, 236-241. For brief survey of relevant modern literature see "Conclusions and postscript," under "Military psychology: *hetaireia* and the primary group."

Thus, according to Iliadic *hetaireia* the bond between a good leader and his subordinates is invincible; but according to Odyssean *hetaireia*, while subordinates may disregard their leader, the result is their own destruction.

* * *

The opening of the *Odyssey* presents sea and suitors as the two major obstacles to Odysseus' homecoming. The sea drowns Odysseus' last *hetairoi* as the first half of the poem ends. The suitors and their supporters are not overcome until the end of Book 24. This chapter examined how Odysseus survives the self-destruction of his *hetairoi*. The next and final chapter of this dissertation considers how Odysseus defeats the suitors to reconquer his homeland without any warrior-companions. If the first half of the *Odyssey* is about the dissolution of *hetaireia*, the second half of the *Odyssey* is about what replaces it. The replacement of *hetaireia* has profound psychological, political, military, and theological significance for the world of Odysseus. Chapter 4 begins to work out some of these consequences.

CHAPTER 4: REPLACING *HETAIREIA* IN THE *ODYSSEY*

Introduction

This chapter closes this dissertation's four-stage presentation of *hetaireia*. In the first chapter, the nature of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* was discussed, chiefly in terms of its effects on individuals in and out of battle. The second chapter treated the role of *hetaireia* in Iliadic military order, beginning with the cognate phrase *ethnos hetairon* and ending with the impact of *hetaireia* on leadership in battle. The third chapter, beginning with the immediate aftermath of the Trojan war, traced the breakdown of trust between king and companions, which culminated in the mutiny and subsequent self-destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi*. Thrinakia left Odysseus entirely alone, without *hetairoi* on expedition and without family at home; and merely landing on the Ithacan shore is not enough to restore him as husband, father, and king. He must fight for his household against an entire cadre of military-age youth; and his wife and his son alone are not strong enough to help him defeat these enemies. This chapter tells the final story of *hetaireia*: what, in the second half of the *Odyssey*, replaces the warrior-companionship that fell apart over the course of the first half.¹ The replacement of *hetaireia* changes the relationship between the

¹ This division of the *Odyssey* into two halves simplifies a much more complex issue. Scholarship on the *Odyssey* has long recognized the 'interwoven' character of the narrative, but the obvious recurrence of many kinds of order (especially ring composition) and general considerations of oral performance have resulted in many treatments of the structure of the *Odyssey*. Louden 2001 offers the most recent book-length treatment of the structure of the *Odyssey*. Bakker 2013 takes the theme of meat (killed and eaten in various ways: rightly, wrongly, impiously, masterfully) to locate small-scale symmetries and highlight contrasts between Odysseus and two groups of foils (suitors and *hetairoi*). For symmetry and structure in the *Odyssey* see also Woodhouse 1930; Myres 1952 (*Odyssey* as triptych at multiple scales); Gaisser 1969 (focusing on ring composition in digressions, but excellent detailed analysis and typology of ring composition in the *Odyssey*); Rutherford 1985 (focusing on similarities between the transition from Book 8 to Book 9, on the one hand, and Book 21 to Book 22, on the other) and 2012, 17-22 (the

hero and his warriors, on the one hand, and the relationship between the king and the gods, on the other.

The argument of this chapter rests on a remarkable fact: Odysseus wins his final battles without any human *hetairoi*. In fact, when Odysseus returns to Ithaca, he has no human *hetairoi* and rebuilds no human *hetaireia*, for his mortal supporters are never called *hetairoi*.² But it is almost as remarkable that *heta(i)r-* already means something starkly non-Iliadic in *Odyssey* 1, long before the poem narrates how *hetaireia* falls apart. While the *Iliad* ends with family and *hetairoi* mourning a warrior killed because he killed another warrior's dearest *hetairos* in battle, the *Odyssey* begins with a promise of a warrior's homecoming from battle in spite of the culpable self-destruction of his *hetairoi*. The first locus of a post-Iliadic social system is the negative refiguring of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* proem, a picture of warrior-companionship that is never restored to its former Iliadic glory, even when Odysseus needs allies to fight at his side.

Although human *hetairoi* are no longer supporters in battle, the word itself does not disappear. Rather, the meaning of the word changes. In the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* are peers, not subject to command and control, even if they are not physically as strong as the hero. In the *Odyssey*, mortal *hetairoi* are sailors, suitors, and three ineffectual old men. Odysseus' military allies are

effect of repetition and magnification on narrative structure, e.g. the role of the Telemachy in the whole; building on Fenik 1974, 180-188); Cook 2014 (rings on multiple scales, matching cycles of nature). Myres 1952, 5-6 discusses Athena as the bridge between first and second half of of poem (amid a useful list of episodes demarcated as stages in the advancement of the plot). For the *Odyssey* as Odysseus' "search for, and progressive discovery of, structure"—by which is meant both social and psychological order, on the one hand, and paratactic order of musical narrative—see Austin 1975, chapters 3 and 4. To my knowledge no scholar has attempted as elaborately broad and deep a schematization of the *Odyssey* as Whitman 1958 attempts for the *Iliad* and explicitly rejects for the *Odyssey* (287).

² As Lord 1960, 181 observes, an armed band of retainers may have formed around the returning Odysseus in an alternate version of Odysseus' *nostos*. If this is true, then Homer's decision to allow only family and slaves to fight with Odysseus suggests deliberate suppression of a less *oikos*-focused variant. For a recent review of the (admittedly thin) evidence for this variant see Haller 2013 *passim*, especially 272-274.

his father, his son, and his slaves. The hero's fellow fighters are inferior by age or social status; *hetairoi* are peers, not of heroes, but of treacherous usurpers, underemployed swineherds, and inexperienced youth.³

But one *hetairos* does fight along with Odysseus in battle. The mortal Mentor is introduced as a trusted steward in Book 2—although apparently not a very successful steward—of Odysseus' household, and his attempt to rouse the Ithacans against a virtual aristocratic coup is quickly suppressed by threats of violence. Almost immediately Athena takes Mentor's form as her favorite disguise; sets Telemachus on his journey in this disguise, giving him twenty sailor-*hetairoi*; and throughout the final books she retains the appearance and voice of Mentor in support of three generations of Ithacan royalty. As her first appearance as Odysseus' *xenos* Mentos in Book 1 sets the plot of the *Odyssey* in motion, her final appearance as Mentor in Book 24, breathing strength into Laertes, resolves the plot of the *Odyssey* and occupies the final line of the poem. Athena's relationship with mortals in the *Odyssey* opens the door to the extension of *hetaireia* by blood—a concept signified by the term *patrios hetairos*, which particularly (though not exclusively) describes Mentor and which never appears in the *Iliad*.

Thus the only warrior-*hetairos* on Ithaca is immortal, and her *hetaireia* obtains exclusively with the Ithacan king, his son, and his father. By the end of the *Odyssey*, *hetaireia* has become divine patronage of a personal favorite; a cosmic force to restore threatened order; and a conservative force to return righteous rulers to power. For vengeance, sorrow, loss, and extreme personal risk—the semantic field activated every time the *Iliad* poet sings of *hetairoi*—the *Odyssey* poet substitutes justice, order, and favoritism at each mention of Ithacan *hetairoi*,

³ Doherty 1991 observes that, because Odysseus has no mortal peers in physical power, his principal foils in the *Odyssey* – Penelope and Athena – are not mortal warriors.

either negatively (suitor-*hetairoi*, who violate the order of the *oikos*; Odysseus' sailor-*hetairoi*, who violate divine property) or positively (swineherd-*hetairoi*, who cannot be warriors because they are slaves; and Athena-*hetairos*, who decides the course of battle).

The replacement of *hetaireia* thus constitutes the final stage of the Homeric transition from a world of warriors to the world of the *oikos*. The new companions-in-arms are either members of the *oikos* or actually divine, and the divine *hetairos* is linked specifically and exclusively with the royal family. The mortals named *hetairoi* are not the companions of the king. The situation at the end of the *Odyssey* is thus prototypical of the political world of archaic Greece. This world has no place for warrior-*hetairoi*. Accordingly, the *Odyssey* replaces warrior-*hetairoi* with supporters that fit neatly into the *oikos*.⁴ This chapter is a study of that replacement.⁵

1. What Odyssean *hetairoi* are not

1.1 Starting over without *hetairoi*: the two *Odyssey* proems

The *Iliad* neither praises nor blames groups of *hetairoi*. In battle, *hetaireia* is a mere fact, like death.⁶ The *Odyssey*, by contrast, praises and blames openly, and the first charge is directed against Odysseus' *hetairoi*:

⁴ The inconnity of *hetaireia* in this world reflects the problematic place of *hetaireia* in actual post-Homeric Greece. The only noble (by social class) *hetairoi* in the *Odyssey* are the *oikos*-destroying, *polis*-endangering suitors. In their infighting they prove untrustworthy like Theognis' *hetairoi*; the mode of their violence (*bia*) against Odysseus' property matches closely the accusations leveled against the noble *hetairoi* of Alcibiades and others in fifth- and fourth-century Athenian oratory and historiography, as dissipated, idling wastrels and aristocratic conspirators against the legitimate government.

⁵ Segal 1994, 34-36 touches this theme briefly ("the *Odyssey* inverts the *Iliad*'s perspective on the bonds created by war": 36).

⁶ For the *Iliad* as a poem of death rather than war or violence (*contra* Weil 1939) see Reinhardt 1960; Schein 1984, 67-88; Zanker 1994, 48n1.

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ

πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε·

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,

πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν,

ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων.

ἄλλ' οὐδ' ὥς ἐτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰέμενός περ·

αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο,

νήπιοι⁷, οἳ κατὰ βοῦς Ὑπερίονος Ἥελίοιο

ἦσθιον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ.

(*Odyssey* 1.1-9)

The proem is about the sufferings and homecoming of an anonymous *aner*, and his greatest suffering is the death of his *hetairoi*.⁸ Not only do they destroy themselves, earning the blaming

⁷ For bibliographical survey of the meaning of νήπιος see Heath 2001, 131n6 (roughly: 'like a child incapable of adult deliberation, especially speech'); for a more complete treatment see Edmunds 1990.

⁸ The absence of the magical adventures narrated in the *Apologoi* is striking. In many scholarly readings of the proem, the dominance of the Thrinakia incident is even more difficult to explain: see e.g. van Groningen 1946, 284-287; Nagler 1990, 346-347 ("seems irrelevant to the narrative it purports to introduce;" Nagler takes the inconcinnity as a signal that others (i.e. the suitors) have committed true self-destructive *atasthalia*); Pedrick 1992, 39 (there must be two separate proems); Rijksbaron 1993 (the prominence of Thrinakia is a sign that the *Apologoi* are not the subject of the poem); Walsh 1995 (Thrinakia joins the past with the present because the incident on Thrinakia drove Odysseus to Ogygia). For the emphasis placed on Thrinakia by the 'antiphonal' structure of the proem and the structural correspondence between the proem and Zeus' theodicy see Cook 1995, 16-30. For the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* proems in general see Bassett 1923; van Groningen 1946; Minton 1960; Pucci 1982; Pedrick 1992; Race 1992. Rüter 1969, 13ff offers an extensive bibliographical survey on the *Odyssey* proem since Bekker 1863 (who influentially rejects the proem because it is unacceptably vague compared with the *Iliad* proem). For insightful word-by-word analysis, including close reading of formal parallels between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* proems (in order to contrast the two with respect to *ethos*), see Pucci 1982, drawing on Clay 1976, 313-316 for the 'subjective' pro-

phrase σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν that Zeus almost immediately associates with violations of cosmic justice (*Odyssey* 1.132-134);⁹ but even their blameworthy self-destruction is subordinated to the perspective of the central (albeit anonymous) hero, insofar as their *atasthalia* appears at the climax of a catalogue of the hero's woes.¹⁰ Moreover, the self-destruction of the *hetairoi* is damningly double-determined: first by their own foolishness (σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο) and second by the gods themselves (αὐτὰρ [ἡέλιος] τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ). By the end of *Odyssey* 12, the new Odyssean *hetairoi* are enemies of both god and each other.¹¹

If the beginning of *Odyssey* 1 promises that Odysseus' *hetairoi* will become casualties on the journey, the beginning of *Odyssey* 13 confirms that Odysseus' *hetairoi* will no longer figure into the story of the hero's return. A second proem occurs early in the book (parallel phrases are formatted similarly):

1.1-9 (proem)	13.89-93 (transitional prologue to final phase)
---------------	---

Odyssean bias of the poem in general and the proem in particular. But see Cook 1995, 15-49 for a critique of the scholarly tendency to interpret the proem in light of narrow interpretations of the *Apologoi*.

⁹ For repetition of the *atasthalia* mentioned in the proem see Nagler 1990; for the *hetairoi* of the proem as morally offensive precursor to the suitors see Rüter 1969, 36; Pucci 1982.

¹⁰ For the anonymity of *aner* see (all following Bekker 1863) Pucci 1987; Bonifazi 2012, chapter 1 (anaphoric anonymity as connoting Odysseus' absence).

¹¹ The general scholarly opinion, although greatly diverse in degree, is that the gods of the *Iliad* are less concerned with morality than the gods of the *Odyssey*. For the contrast between Iliadic and Odyssean views of divine justice see e.g. Dodds 1951 (the *Odyssey* has a much stronger sense of punishment for wrongdoing, but such a notion is not entirely absent from the *Iliad*); Adkins 1960, 62 (neither Iliadic nor Odyssean gods are concerned with moral right); Kirk 1962, 291 (Zeus' theodicy is true); Havelock 1968 (*Iliad*: no principles of justice, but procedures for resolving disputes within a community, and enemies are not moralized; *Odyssey*: the Olympian council oversees universal justice, and enemies are morally evil); Lloyd-Jones 1971 (opposed to Dodds' position but, in Dodds' own view, complementary); Nagy 1979, 113n3; Mueller 1984, 147; Edwards 1987, 130; Zanker 1994, 7; Pucci 1998, 19n20; Allan 2006; Versnel 2011, chapter 2 (undermining the distinction between just and unjust). General theological difference: Finley 1978, 52-53; Lesky 1961; Kirk 1962, 291; Rüter 1969, 38; Lloyd-Jones 1971, 28; Schwabl 1978; Griffin 1980, 50-54; Kullmann 1985 (many excellent insights); Erbse 1986; Burkert 1997, 259; Kearns 2004, 67-69. Morality in the *Odyssey*: Havelock 1968, chapter 9; Lloyd-Jones 1971, chapter 2; Hankey 1990; Yamagata 1994. For additional bibliography see Versnel 2011, 160n27.

<p>Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ <u>πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε</u>¹² πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς ἐτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰέμενός περ· αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο, νήπιοι, οἳ κατὰ βοῆς Ὑπερίονος Ἥελιοιο ἦσθιον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ. τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν. ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον, οἴκοι ἔσαν, <u>πόλεμόν τε πεφνευότες ἠδὲ θάλασσαν</u>·</p>	<p>ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μῆδε' ἔχοντα, ὃς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, <u>ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἄλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων</u>·</p>
---	---

Both passages catalogue the sufferings of the line-initial ἄνδρα. Besides some differences in word choice (offset by the parallels between ἄνδρα and πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν), the biggest difference between the two passages is the absence from the second of the italicized portion in the first. The absent passage is about two things: the loss of Odysseus' self-destructive *hetairoi* and the return from war of those that escaped destruction. The phrase from the proem that describes other Achaeans' safe escape from war and the sea is modified in Book 13 to describe Odysseus' sorrowful but successful return through wars and waves. If the *hetairoi* were impious self-destroyers in *Odyssey* 1, they have disappeared altogether by the time Odysseus sails back to Ithaca.¹² *Nostos* has no place for *hetairoi*.

¹² Odysseus also excludes the self-destruction of the *hetairoi* from the list of sufferings he mentions in the Cretan tale he tells Athena on the Ithacan shore (*Odyssey* 13.256-286). The exclusion of *hetairoi* from this second list of sufferings somewhat vitiates the characterization offered in Pucci 1998, 13 of Odysseus as “paternally attentive to the welfare of his own men,” a characterization that depends heavily on the content of the *algea* presented in the proem.

1.2 The new *hetairoi*: sailors, suitors, steward, and slaves

At first, then, Odysseus' *hetairoi* are wayward; and then they are expunged. For Odysseus, human *hetaireia* remains absent until the end of the poem. But there are other human *hetairoi* in the post-Thrinakia world. They come in four types, all emphatically far from Iliadic: the seer Halitherses and the steward Mentor, introduced as *patrioi hetairoi* to Telemachus; Telemachus' evanescent sailor-*hetairoi*; Eumaius' swineherd-*hetairoi*; and the suitors who fail to ambush Telemachus¹³ and fail to string Odysseus' bow. This attenuation of *hetaireia* must represent a deliberate choice of the *Odyssey* poet (or suggest that the *Odyssey* poet is not the same as the poet of the *Iliad*), for *hetairoi* in the *Odyssey* are not different by nature from *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*. Penelope's suitors represent the warrior class of Ithaca and nearby islands, and the *hetairoi* in *Odyssey* 3 and 4 are actually veterans of the Trojan war.

1.2.1a Athena-Mentes' nonexistent sailor-*hetairoi*

Just as the first *hetairoi* mentioned in the *Odyssey* are sailors who do not return home, the second group of *hetairoi* are the imaginary sailors that Athena-Mentes claims brought her to Ithaca:

Μέντης¹⁴ Ἀγχιάλοιο δαΐφρονος εὖχομαι εἶναι

υἱός, ἀτὰρ Ταφίοισι φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσω.

¹³ In this case the suitor-*hetairoi* are also sailors, set by Antinous against Telemachus' sailor-*hetairoi*: ἄλλ' ἄγε μοι δότε νῆα θοὴν καὶ εἵκοσ' ἐταίρους (*Odyssey* 4.669=2.212).

¹⁴ In the *Iliad*, Apollo disguises himself as "Mentes, commander of the Kikones" (εἰσάμενος Κικόνων ἡγήτορι Μέντη: 17.73) in order to rouse Hector to strip Patroclus' corpse. Athena's choice of persona is perhaps subtly ironic insofar as Odysseus first begins to lose *hetairoi* when he foolishly leads them in an attack on the Kikones. Athena-Mentes is not commander of the Kikones, of course.

νῦν δ' ὧδε ξὺν νηϊ κατήλυθον ἢ δ' ἐτάροισι,

πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον ἐπ' ἄλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους,

ἐς Τεμέσῃν μετὰ χαλκόν, ἄγω δ' αἶθωνα σίδηρον.

(*Odyssey* 1.180-184)

Athena's feigned sailor-*hetairoi* are what Odysseus will never have again. He has no more *hetairoi*; he will come to Ithaca without them. Athena apparently does have *hetairoi*, and when she takes the form of Mentor, she becomes the hero's own *hetairos*, something no god ever does in the *Iliad*. But here in Book 1 Athena-Mentes is seen as the negation of a returning Odysseus when Telemachus notices her first:

τὴν δὲ πολὺν πρῶτος ἶδε Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής·

ἦστο γὰρ ἐν μνηστῆρσι φίλον τετιημένος ἦτορ,

ὀσσομένος πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, εἴ ποθεν ἐλθὼν

μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη,

τιμὴν δ' αὐτὸς ἔχοι καὶ κτήμασιν οἷσιν ἀνάσσοι.

(*Odyssey* 1.113-117)

Telemachus was imagining his father (ὁσσόμενος πατέρ'), but instead he saw another man arriving on Ithaca.¹⁵ He asks how the stranger has arrived, in a phrase he repeats to Odysseus at their reunion in Book 16:

ὁποίης τ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο; πῶς δέ σε ναῦται

ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;

οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν ὄϊομαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι.

(Telemachus to Mentos: *Odyssey* 1.171-173)

ποίη γὰρ νῦν δεῦρο, πάτερ φίλε, νηῖ σε ναῦται

ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;

οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν ὄϊομαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι.

(Telemachus to Odysseus: *Odyssey* 16.222-224)

But the stranger does have news of Telemachus' father: Athena-Mentes declares that Odysseus is not dead (*Odyssey* 1.196) but rather is held unwillingly on an island by wild, violent men. She declares mantically (200: ἐγὼ μαντεύσομαι) that Odysseus will not be away from home for much longer—not even if men lock him in irons—for he is too crafty (204-205).

Telemachus' reply emphasizes the negation of the image of Odysseus accompanied by *hetairoi*. When Athena-Mentes explains that Odysseus is kept from home by evil, rough men (χαλεποὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν, / ἄγριοι: *Odyssey* 1.198-199), Telemachus wishes that Odysseus

¹⁵ Telemachus feels Athena-Mentes' concern as paternal at *Odyssey* 1.307-308: ξεῖν', ἧ τοι μὲν ταῦτα φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύεις, / ὥς τε πατὴρ ᾧ παιδί. Race 1993, 81n6 observes of these lines that "[Telemachus'] imaginings of his father are in fact a plot synopsis of the epic's second half."

had died at Troy, among his *hetairoi* and *philoι* (εἰ μετὰ οἷς' ἐτάροισι δάμνη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ, / ἥ ἐ φίλων ἐν χερσίν: 237-238). This mention of *hetaireia*, a throwback to the *Iliad*, is explicitly counterfactual.

Thus the first (purported) *hetairoi* in the narrative time of the *Odyssey* are Athena-Mentes' sailor-*hetairoi*—who are rowers, not warriors; or rather fantasies calculated to boost Telemachus' morale. Indeed, the poem summarizes the effect of Athena's first intervention with a practical definition of moral support: “she put strength and courage in him” (τῷ δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ / θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσος: 320-321).

1.2.1b Telemachus' ephemeral sailor-*hetairoi*

Strength and courage from Athena-Mentes inspire Telemachus to call the first Ithacan assembly in twenty years, but the assembly changes nothing in the royal household. The suitors' *bia* persists; Telemachus himself remains powerless. But then Athena-Mentor promises Telemachus his own *hetairoi*; and for a third time these *hetairoi* are sailors, a group selected to help him find news of his father. This expedition begins the series of events that finally restores the royal household.

In his prayer to Athena on the Ithacan shore, Telemachus had asked only for the help of whatever god had appeared to him (as Mentes) on the previous day (*Odyssey* 2.262-266). But in reply Athena offers him a group of “willing *hetairoi*”:

... ἐγὼ δ' ἀνὰ δῆμον ἐταίρους

αἶψ' ἐθελοντῆρας συλλέξομαι.

(*Odyssey* 2.291-292)

Two words are remarkable in this passage: δῆμον and ἐθελοντῆρας. Neither word is associated with *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad*. First, Telemachus’ *hetairoi* will be gathered “throughout the community” (ἀνὰ δῆμον)—a mass of *hetairoi* signified by the same word Mentor uses during the assembly to describe the mass of the many Ithacan citizens.¹⁶ Neither the discovery of *hetairoi* in a community nor the pairing with ἀνά occur in the *Iliad*, which instead uses *ethnos hetairon* (never used in the *Odyssey*) to describe groups of *hetairoi*. Iliadic *hetairoi* are grouped like birds and bees (also called *ethnea*)—dynamic unities defined by the shared movement of individuals, not *en masse*.¹⁷ Second, Telemachus’ *hetairoi* will be “voluntary”; but predicating *etheleront-* of *hetairoi* in the *Iliad* would be redundant,¹⁸ because Iliadic warriors are never made to act as *hetairoi* unwillingly.¹⁹ But the misbehavior of Odysseus’ *hetairoi* proves that, in the *Odyssey*, unwilling *hetairoi* may need to be compelled for their own good.²⁰

That these words modify Telemachus’ *hetairoi* is evidence that the meaning of *hetaireia* itself has changed. Odysseus’ story to the Phaeacians in Books 9 through 12 shows how *hetaireia* breaks down; but that story is yet to come, and Homer’s audience has not yet heard that *hetairoi* may require compulsion. Telemachus does not have *hetairoi* yet, so his particular twenty

¹⁶ See discussion below, under “Mentor the steward and Halitherses the seer: powerless *patrioi hetairoi*.”

¹⁷ For *ethnos* as dynamic unity see Chapter 2, under “ἔθνος ἐταίρων as group of *hetairoi*.”

¹⁸ The only Iliadic parallel occurs at *Iliad* 4.265-271, where Idomeneus declares that he will be Agamemnon’s *hetairos* as he “swore and assented” (τοὶ ἐγὼν ἐρίηρος ἐταῖρος / ἔσσομαι, ὥς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα: *Iliad* 4.266-267). This case of *hetaireia* is also voluntary, like the *hetaireia* between Telemachus and these twenty young Ithacans. But *etheleront-* is not predicated of Idomeneus *hetairos*: the focus is on Idomeneus’ previous assent to be *hetairos* as an account of what he is about to do by way of something he did in the past, not on his present willingness to be *hetairos*. For Idomeneus’ oath (probably not the oath of Tyndareus) see Chapter 2, under “Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans.”

¹⁹ For Achilles’ correction of his refusal to allow his “unwilling *hetairoi*” to fight see Chapter 2, under “Paragons of *hetaireia*: Achilles, Patroclus, and the Myrmidons.”

²⁰ Beginning with the Lotus-Eaters and continuing through the Sirens: see Chapter 3, under “Cicones and Lotus-eaters: dead and unreliable *hetairoi*.”

have not demonstrated any need to distinguish compulsion from voluntarism, on the one hand, or dynamic aggregation from organizational division, on the other. Nevertheless, Athena describes these *hetairoi*-to-be in terms that suggest that some *hetaireia* is voluntary. The term *heta(i)r-* itself, rather than the behavior of the particular *hetairoi* signified, admits the possibility of assent or dissent.²¹ Such a distinction would be inconceivable in the *Iliad*, where warriors are named *hetairoi de facto*.

As it turns out, Telemachus' *hetairoi* obey him perfectly, and one is singled out as particularly loyal.²² Unlike Odysseus' *hetairoi*, Telemachus' *hetairoi* prove neither unwilling nor homogeneous. They are Iliadic by epithet and Odyssean by job: they are well-greaved like Iliadic warriors and rowers like Odysseus' *hetairoi*.²³ But this *hetaireia* is ephemeral. The *hetairoi* disband precisely when Telemachus reaches maturity—when he joins Odysseus to plot against the suitors—and, as they were constituted, so also they dissolve at Athena's command:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ πρῶτην ἀκτὴν Ἰθάκης ἀφίκηται,

νῆα μὲν ἐς πόλιν ὀτρύνει καὶ πάντας ἑταίρους,

αὐτὸς δὲ πρότιστα συβώτην εἰσαφικέσθαι,

²¹ The usage at *Odyssey* 2.291-292 is thus a subtle semantic foreshadowing of the poor behavior of Odysseus' *hetairoi* in Books 9 through 12. Athena's words do not paint *hetaireia* badly, but they open conceptual space for *hetairoi* to behave disobediently and as a mob.

²² Peiraios: *Odyssey* 15.539-544.

²³ ἔυκνήμιδες appears only ten times in the *Odyssey*, and always modifies either *hetairoi* (5 times) or *Akhaioi* (5 times). It appears thirty-one times in the *Iliad*. It is the most common epithet of *Akhaioi* in the *Iliad*, followed by 'long-haired' (κομόωντες), which appears 29 times. Κομόωντες appears only four times in the *Odyssey*. It appears six lines after this appearance of 'well-greaved' (2.408). In the *Odyssey*, 'well-greaved' and 'long-haired' both import Iliadic warrior-companionship, especially when used together within a few lines. In Athena's words, Telemachus' *hetairoi* are both Iliadic, because they are well-greaved and long-haired, and Odyssean, because they are at the oar. The formulaic language preserves Iliadic military epithets that are proved inappropriate over the course of the *Odyssey*.

ὅς τοι ὕδ' ἐπίουρος, ὁμῶς δέ τοι ἥπια οἶδεν.

(*Odyssey* 15.36-39)

Poetic choices in this passage emphasize the split of newly-minted hero from supporting *hetaireia*. The line-initial αὐτὸς δέ sets Telemachus against all his *hetairoi* (πάντας ἐταίρους, closing the previous line).²⁴ Hero and *hetairoi* go their separate ways, and the difference between their two destinations is significant. The *hetairoi* go to the settlement (and cease to be *hetairoi*)—the place of the present, problematic situation, returning unchanged whence they came. But the hero heads for the swineherd's hut, the peripheral source of hope against the present situation, to become the warrior son of the returning king rather than, as he had departed, the complaining but powerless son of the beleaguered queen.

Later in Book 15 another divine message separates Telemachus from his sailor-*hetairoi*. On the way back to Ithaca, Theoclymenus the seer comes aboard. When he first exercises his prophetic powers, he does so only after taking Telemachus away from his *hetairoi*:

τὸν δὲ Θεοκλύμενος ἐτάρων ἀπονόσφι καλέσσας

ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·

“Τηλέμαχ', οὗ τοι ἄνευ θεοῦ ἦλυθε δεξιὸς ὄρνις·

ἔγνων γάρ μιν ἐσάντα ἰδὼν οἰωνὸν ἔοντα.

ὑμέτερου δ' οὐκ ἔστι γένευσ βασιλεύτερον ἄλλο

²⁴ The metrical structure of this phrase (bucolic dieresis) both lumps all the *hetairoi* together and heightens the sense of finality, and via this sense of finality heightens the contrast expressed by αὐτὸς δέ at the beginning of the next line.

ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς καρτεροὶ αἰεὶ.”

(*Odyssey* 15.529-534)

The phrase ἐτάρων ἀπονόσφι is unique in Homer; the more general phrase νόσφι plus *hetairoi* is also very rare.²⁵ The content of the prophecy explains why Theoclymenus feels it necessary to pull Telemachus aside from his *hetairoi*. The appearance of the dove in a hawk's talons signifies Apollo's sanction of the Ithacan royal birth-line (γένευσ). Telemachus' royal clan is more kingly than any other in the Ithacan *demos*; they will remain in power forever (καρτεροὶ αἰεὶ). If the hawk represents the royal clan and the dove represents those whom the royal clan dominates, then Telemachus corresponds to the hawk, and his *hetairoi*, no less than Penelope's suitors, correspond to the dove. This symbolism shows how far *hetaireia* has departed from the *Iliad*. No such image could possibly describe any Iliadic *basileus* and his *hetairoi*.

The post-Iliadic character of Telemachus' *hetaireia* is also demonstrated by the one *hetairos* who earns special trust. As Telemachus prepares to leave for Eumaius' hut, he asks Peiraios to take care of Theoclymenus for now:

ἦ, καὶ Πείραιον προσεφώνεε, **πιστὸν ἐταῖρον**·

“Πείραιε Κλυτίδη, σὺ δέ μοι τά περ ἄλλα **μάλιστα**

πεῖθῃ ἐμῶν ἐτάρων, οἳ μοι Πύλον εἰς ἅμ' ἔποντο·

καὶ νῦν μοι τὸν ξεῖνον ἄγων ἐν δώμασι σοῖσιν

²⁵ Three appearances in the *Odyssey* (4.367; 12.33; 15.529) and two in the *Iliad* (1.349; 17.382-383). *Iliad* 1.349 describes Achilles praying to Thetis alone on the shore of the Troad, an example of his separation from the army (which ultimately leads to separation from his *hetairos* Patroclus).

ἐνδυκέως φιλέειν καὶ τιέμεν, εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθω.”

(*Odyssey* 15.539-544)

The Homeric phrase πιστὸς ἑταῖρος appears elsewhere only in the *Iliad*, and it is typical in the *Iliad* for *peitho* to take *hetairoi* as object—as the common root suggests. The subdivision of *hetairoi* into those that deserve more and less trust (μάλιστα...ἐμῶν ἐτάρων), however, is new. In the *Iliad*, no *hetairos* earns more trust than another. Such uniformity of trust is more or less demanded by the battlefield situation: *in extremis*, no companion can offer more than his life. But Telemachus’ *hetairoi* have faced no such dangers, and apparently trustworthiness has been manifest to different degrees. Moreover, in the *Iliad*, *pistos hetairos* specifically signifies a companion who is killed in the battle leading up to Patroclus’ death.²⁶ But when Telemachus does enter battle, he specifically excludes even his most trusted *hetairos* (*Odyssey* 17.78-83)—a move that would be unspeakably foolish at Troy. In the *Iliad*, the hero’s special *hetairos* is his closest intimate, but all *hetairoi* are trusted perfectly. In the *Odyssey*, the hero’s special *hetairos* is simply the one who deserves the greatest trust—but not in battle.²⁷

1.2.1c Post-war *hetairoi* fleeing the gods

The primary function of Telemachus’ voluntary *hetairoi* is transport. They “accomplish travel here and there” (*Odyssey* 2.213) and cease to be called *hetairoi* when the journey is over. The other *hetairoi* mentioned in *Odyssey* 3 and 4 are also sailors, not fighters. They too are *hetairoi* on the sea, and no longer appear after *nostos* is complete. Again these new *hetairoi* are

²⁶ For *peith/pist* in the *Iliad* see Chapter 1, under “The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: Patroclus and the death of the *pistos hetairos*.”

²⁷ For the accuracy of Telemachus’ description see Roisman 1994, 17-19.

non-military companions whose bond is created not by common danger in battle but rather by shared mission overseas.

Unlike Telemachus' *hetairoi*, however, the sailor-*hetairoi* mentioned at Pylos and Sparta were once warriors at Troy. They are physically the same as Iliadic warrior-*hetairoi*; but in the *Odyssey* they do not fight together. Nestor speaks of Diomedes' and Idomeneus' *hetairoi*, and Menelaus speaks of Odysseus' and his own *hetairoi*, all in the context of *nostos*.²⁸ All are sailors, and most are described as "fleeing" from Troy. They appear only in the stories of homecoming. None appear in Telemachus' presence, and none seem to be part of either royal court.

Like Telemachus' sailors, the veteran *hetairoi* in Nestor's story are roused like Iliadic warriors. The commanding hero is Diomedes, the second most dangerous Achaean hero, but the objective is escape from an angry god:

φεῦγον, ἐπεὶ γίνωσκον, ὃ δὴ κακὰ μήδετο δαίμων.

φεῦγε δὲ Τυδέος υἱὸς Ἀρήϊος, ὥρσε δ' ἑταίρους.

(*Odyssey* 3.166-167)

In the *Iliad*, ὥρσε often signifies battlefield commands.²⁹ Here the command is non-military in two ways. First, the content is flight (φεῦγε), which often occurs in the *Iliad* but is never commanded. Second, the enemy is a god (δαίμων) – a common enough problem in the *Iliad*, but

²⁸ For the journey to Pylos and Sparta as a means to include various other *nostoi* in the *Odyssey* see Woodhouse 1930, 209 and Kirk 1962, 356. Burgess 2001 argues convincingly that evidence sometimes adduced for a distinct pre-Homeric epic called *Nostoi* (as represented in Proclus' summary) shows only that tales of *nostoi* other than Odysseus' were current during the composition of the *Odyssey*, not that Nestor's and Menelaus' stories represent any Homeric attempt to absorb another well-formed rival poem. Davies 1989 remains a useful review of linguistic evidence for post-Homeric dating of many Cyclical passages (usually following Wilamowitz 1884 and Wackernagel 1916) but offers no clues from the *Nostoi* fragments.

²⁹ See appendix and discussion in Chapter 2, under "Leading groups of *hetairoi* I: norms."

the reason the god is fearsome is different. Iliadic gods threaten mortals by fighting in battle, with weapons, as hyper-powerful warriors. Moreover, in the *Iliad*, warfighting gods are named in the narrative, whether or not humans recognize them.³⁰ Contrariwise, in the *Odyssey*, gods are never warriors and their wrath derives less from personal offense and more from cosmic justice.³¹ Because these gods are not fighters, they cannot be fought. Even warlike (ἀρήϊος) Diomedes, Iliadic *theomakhos par excellence*, elects not to fight them in the *Odyssey*. He rouses the *hetairoi* only to run away.

If Diomedes will rouse *hetairoi* only to flight, it is all the more reasonable that a less audacious hero would do the same. Nestor's story confirms the principle a few lines later, as Idomeneus leads all his *hetairoi* in flight from war:

πάντας δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρήτην εἰσήγαγ' ἑταίρους,

οἳ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου, πόντος δέ οἱ οὐ τιν' ἀπηύρα.

(*Odyssey* 3.191-192)

The logic of a *nostos* plot demands return, not war, and so Homer describes Idomeneus' *hetairoi* as “those that escaped the war” (οἳ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου), not as “those that won” or “those that sacked Troy.” Diomedes' and Idomeneus' post-Iliadic *hetairoi* are sailors, not fighters; they escape (φεύγον) from war.

³⁰ For varying human ability to perceive the gods in the *Iliad* see Turkeltaub 2007.

³¹ Or so Zeus claims; but Poseidon and Helios are apparently counterexamples (insofar as both inflict punishment for personal reasons), and Athena herself begins the plot of the poem by citing Odysseus' own imprisonment on Ogygia as evidence against Zeus' theodicy. For the much-vexed issue of theodicy see discussion below, under “Cosmic justice and Odysseus' *nostos*: Athena-*hetairos*' twofold mission.” For Athena's particular involvement in the troubles of all post-Trojan *nostoi* see Clay 1994.

The presentation of these two sets of post-war *hetairoi* prepares Telemachus for Menelaus' report of his father. In Sparta, Menelaus explains that Odysseus is indeed alive, but cannot return home for lack of "rowers and *hetairoi*," quoting the omniscient Proteus:

τὸν δ' ἶδον ἐν νήσῳ θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα,

νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς, ἥ μιν ἀνάγκη

ἴσχει· ὁ δ' οὐ δύναται ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι·

οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἐταῖροι,

οἳ κέν μιν πέμποιεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης.

(*Odyssey* 4.557-561)

Proteus' aetiology is not quite accurate. The audience already knows (*Odyssey* 1.14) that Calypso's compulsion, not a lack of rowers, keeps Odysseus on Ogygia. Indeed, in Book 5, Odysseus will leave Ogygia on a one-man raft, no oarsmen necessary (5.241-281). In Book 8, he will return to Ithaca in a magical Phaeacian ship that needs no steersman or rudder (8.557-558), although the ships are eventually manned by Phaeacian *hetairoi* (13.21). Lack of sailors is not Odysseus' problem; the problem is opposition by the gods, by Calypso and Poseidon in particular. By overvaluing Odysseus' *hetairoi*, Proteus highlights by contrast their actual role in Odysseus' homecoming. On an Iliadic model of *hetaireia*, it is reasonable to suppose that a hero is kept from home by lack of *hetairoi*. It is only on the Odyssean model, mentioned in the proem but not yet narrated in full, that the actions of *hetairoi* are precisely what keeps the hero from home.

But Menelaus is well aware of the gods' role in his own homecoming. In order to force Proteus to prophesy, the goddess Eidothea offers Menelaus a stratagem that involves a new attitude toward *hetaireia*:

ἐνθα σ' ἐγὼν ἀγαγοῦσα ἄμ' ἡοῖ φαινομένηφιν

εὐνάσω ἐξείης· σὺ δ' ἐὺ κρίνασθαι ἑταίρους

τρεῖς, οἳ τοι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐϋσσέλμοισιν ἄριστοι.

(*Odyssey* 4.407-409)

Eidothea recommends not only the tactic (ambush of a sleeping Proteus) but also a mode of selection of *hetairoi* that requires Menelaus to distinguish among sub-groups of *hetairoi*. For the plot to work, Menelaus must distinguish (κρίνασθαι) *hetairoi* into “best” (ἄριστοι) and otherwise. Such a distinction within the set of *hetairoi* is unknown in the *Iliad*.³² The adjective ἄριστοι never modifies *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*, but it does so twice in the *Odyssey*,³³ and both Odysseus and Telemachus distinguish sub-sets of *hetairoi* for special missions as special objects of trust.³⁴ Given the *de facto* semantics of *heta(i)r-* in the *Iliad*, whereby warriors are named *hetairoi* only when they are acting as *hetairoi*, and given the mutual need that activates *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*, it is not only false but also unintelligible, in Iliadic terms, that *hetairoi* should be ranked by excellence and trust. But in the *Odyssey*, a goddess tells Menelaus to make such a distinction before Odysseus' *nostos* even begins.

³² Ajax divides warriors in general into best, middling, and worst (*Iliad* 12.269-274) without calling them *hetairoi* (discussed in Chapter 2, under “Norms of Iliadic leadership: κέλομαι, ὀτρύνω, and θαρσύνω”).

³³ *Odyssey* 4.408-409; 9.195.

³⁴ Telemachus at *Odyssey* 15.539-544; Odysseus on the Cyclopes' island (9.172), at the Laestrygonian harbor (10.128), and on the Aiaian shore (10.203).

Although the *hetairoi* of Diomedes, Idomeneus, and Menelaus function as sailors in the Cyclic *Nostoi*, the individual *hetairoi* are not chiefly sailors. They are veterans of Troy, warriors by nature who happen to be fighting in a land across the sea. But sailor-*hetairoi* by nature do appear in the *Odyssey*. The Phaeacians, the greatest sailors of all, are emphatically not warriors, and their sailing ability is again connected with the theme of *nostos*:

καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖ κατέθηχ' ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο,
αὐτὸς ἰὼν διὰ νηός, ὑπὸ ζυγά, **μή τιν' ἑταίρων**
βλάπτοι ἐλαυνόντων, ὅποτε σπερχοίατ' ἑρετμοῖς·
(*Odyssey* 13.20-22)

These Phaeacian *hetairoi* are not merely accidental sailors, as perhaps were Diomedes', Idomeneus', and Menelaus'. Rather, they are rowers (from ἑρετμοῖς) and rowers alone. They are related to Alcinous in no way except as sailors on his ship. But they are called *hetairoi*, just as Telemachus' *hetairoi* are simply the “willing” Ithacans that Athena selects to man Telemachus' ship. These sailors by nature, later petrified by Poseidon for carrying a cursed wanderer over the sea, are *hetairoi* by transportive role.³⁵

By the end of the Telemachy, *hetairoi* have come to play a different role than the warrior-companions of the *Iliad*. All stories of human *hetairoi* in the Telemachy treat *hetaireia* as a way to get home, a non-military relationship in service of *nostos*. Military *hetaireia* is past as the

³⁵ The petrification of the ship that carried Odysseus is not a matter of textual controversy, but the covering of all Scheria—apparently sanctioned by Zeus at *Odyssey* 13.158—has been disputed since antiquity. For the disagreement between Aristophanes and Aristarchus over this line (with bibliography), see Friedrich 1989.

Trojan war is past. Restoration of the *oikos* is the next order of business, even for those that once fought as warrior-*hetairoi* at Troy.

1.2.2 Suitors: treacherous and twice-failed warrior-band

Sailor-*hetairoi* and warrior-*hetairoi* share a sort of solidarity: blood-soaked or water-surrounded, all are in the same boat. But suitor-*hetairoi* are another matter. The suitors are the villains of the poem, righteously slain by the king and the gods, and, along with sailors, slaves, and two old men, they are the only humans called *hetairoi* after the disaster on Thrinakia. They are called *hetairoi* five times, and in all but one case they are trying to act like warrior-companions. In every case the attempt is nefarious; and in every case the suitors fail.

The suitors ought not have solidarity in the first place, let alone the deep bond of *hetaireia*. It follows from the definition of non-polyandrous marriage that suitors must contend with one another in a zero-sum and winner-take-all game—not merely for dominance, where multiple orders of superiority might obtain (as in the case of the warrior Achilles and Agamemnon the king),³⁶ but rather for sole primacy and paternity in the *oikos*, as husband of the queen.³⁷ In the world of epic, the singularity of the husband is the central stumbling-block of both Homeric plots, and marriage is the only contest (besides war itself) in which second place

³⁶ See Scodel 2001 for three suitors' games (all are zero-sum). For marriage with Penelope as a competition see Thomas 1988 and Thalmann 1998, 181-188.

³⁷ Thus the political situation on Ithaca, which admits of multiple *basileis*, does not pit the suitors against each other; but the erotic situation, where Penelope is the wife of the head of the household, does. Ithaca need not be a monarchy in the strong sense (i.e. that sovereignty belongs to Odysseus or his replacement alone) in order for the suitors' game to be zero-sum. Thus we need accept neither Finley's picture of royal Ithacan succession (1978, 86-87) nor Halverson's (1986) rejection of this picture in order to maintain that the suitors ought not conspire as a group. Penelope's husband is not politically sovereign, but only her husband rules Odysseus' household.

gains nothing.³⁸ There is no place for mutual support in such a game. Accordingly there is no place for *hetaireia* in the wooing of Penelope. When the suitors make themselves *hetairoi*, they are not wooing Penelope, but conspiring against the royal family. A Männerbund in the palace constitutes rebellion, not an inconveniently persistent marriage suit.

Although they have the concept of *hetaireia*, and want to embody it, the suitors cannot be warrior-companions. They fail to act as warriors when they are called *hetairoi*; their imitation of Iliadic *hetaireia* is absurd. Their first attempt to form warrior-*hetaireia* comes when they try to kill Telemachus. Previously they had neither tried to kill anyone nor been called *hetairoi*. Their error hitherto was partly erotic, mostly economic, without even simulated Iliadic *hetaireia*. But when Antinous hears that Telemachus has gone to hear news of his father, he devises a plan to ambush him with a new set of suitor-*hetairoi*:

ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι δότε νῆα θοὴν καὶ εἵκοσ' ἑταίρους,

ὄφρα μιν αὖτις ἰόντα λοχῆσομαι ἡδὲ φυλάξω

ἐν πορθμῷ Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιό τε παιπαλοέσσης,

ὥς ἂν ἐπισμυγερῶς ναυτίλεται εἵνεκα πατρός.

(*Odyssey* 4.669-673)

The murderous first case of suitor-*hetaireia* is set explicitly against Telemachus' fact-finding transport-*hetaireia*. Antinous' words repeat Telemachus' request for *hetairoi* verbatim (*Odyssey* 4.669=2.212). The two bands are equally matched: twenty suitor-*hetairoi* in ambush are set

³⁸ Contrast the prizes Achilles offers first, second, and third place in *Iliad* 23: coming in first is highly sought, of course, but the losers still reap significant rewards.

against twenty sailor-*hetairoi en route*. The aura of military success still glows around the *heta(i)r-* root; Antinous uses the word to turn wastrels into warriors. But *hetaireia* does not function for the suitors as it functions for warriors in the *Iliad*. The suitor-*hetairoi* do not kill Telemachus, but their plot does earn Penelope's anger in Book 16, expressed in the form of a far stronger condemnation than she had previously spoken (418-433).

The plot against Telemachus' *hetairoi* not only fails; worse, Antinous' suitor-*hetairoi* do not even fight. Their failure earns a laugh from the suitor Amphinomus, whose speech is introduced by the second naming of the suitors as *hetairoi*:³⁹

ἦδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνεεν οἷσ' ἐτάροισι·

μή τιν' ἔτ' ἀγγελίην ὀτρύνομεν· οἶδε γὰρ ἔνδον.

ἢ τίς σφιν τόδ' ἔειπε θεῶν ἢ εἴσιδον αὐτοῖ

νῆα παρερχομένην, τὴν δ' οὐκ ἐδύναντο κιχῆναι.

(*Odyssey* 16.354-357)

The verb ὀτρύνομεν calls attention to the absurdity of the suitors' attempt at any military operation. In the *Iliad* ὀτρύνω regularly signifies rousing in battle. In the *Odyssey* it often also describes commands issued to *hetairoi*, albeit never in battle. But here, as Eurymachus has just suggested (*Odyssey* 16.346-350), Amphinomus addresses suitor-*hetairoi* in response to the sight

³⁹ Amphinomus (the "good suitor") pleases Penelope with his *euphrosyne* (*Odyssey* 16.399), receives Odysseus' compliments (18.125), and would not have been killed if Athena's justice were not absolute and non-individualized (Murnaghan 1987, 178). The poem says nothing about the suitors' reaction to Amphinomus' laugh, but γελάω often connotes mockery in Homer (and elsewhere in Greek): Levine 1983 (also c.f. LfgrE s.v.).

of the *lokhos-hetairoi* already returned to port. There is no need to signal to them that Telemachus has returned, because the *hetairoi* in *lokhos* have already given up.⁴⁰

Their first attempt at physical force having fallen flat, the suitors test their warrior prowess again in a vain effort to string Odysseus' bow. Again Antinous tries to rouse their martial powers by calling them *hetairoi*. The pretension rings even more hollow than before, for they cannot even prepare the weapons of war. As the archery contest begins, Antinous tries to "rouse the *hetairoi*":⁴¹

ὥς [Ἀντίνοος] φάτο, τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐώλπει

νευρὴν ἐντανύειν διοῖστέυσειν τε σιδήρου.

ἦ τοι οὔστοῦ γε πρῶτος γεύσασθαι ἔμελλεν

ἐκ χειρῶν Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ὃν τότε ἄτιμα

ἦμενος ἐν μεγάροις, ἐπὶ δ' ὄρνυε πάντας ἐταίρους.

⁴⁰ Antinous' response to Amphinomus' observation (*Odyssey* 16.364-392) echoes Mentor's critique of the *demos* for their inaction in Book 2 – and perhaps also prefigures the opposition between noble *hetairoi* and the *demos* in post-Homeric Greek society.

⁴¹ The introduction of the bow activates two relevant themes: physical strength (which the contest shows the suitors lack) and *xenia* (which the suitors have been violating for years). For the history of the bow as sign of physical strength, see Galinsky 1972, 11-13; as sign of friendship and *xenia* (explicit at *Odyssey* 21.40: μνημα ξείνοιο φίλοιο), see discussion (with sources) in Clay 1984, 91nn68-69. For the poetic legerdemain required to puzzle together the various traditions surrounding the bow's possession by Heracles, Philoctetes, Eurytus, Iphitus, and Odysseus, see Clay 1984, 90-96. Crissy 1997 argues, *contra* the common scholarly opinion that the introduction of the bow contributes to the presentation of the violent, *xenia*-violating Heracles as foil for clever, *xenia*-defending Odysseus (e.g. Galinsky 1972, 12; Clay 1984, 95), that the passage instead suggests parallels between Heracles and Odysseus by drawing attention to the violence and moral ambiguity of killing the suitors at dinner. But Crissy's argument depends on Homeric moral rejection of Odysseus' vengeance, for which all evidence is ambiguous (despite the best efforts of Hankey 1990). For a recent evaluation (with excellent bibliography) of the portrayal of Heracles' violence in Homer see Lu 2013, 22-33 (who argues that, except for one interpolated passage, both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* portray Heracles as frightening and uncontrollable, at best, and dangerous and immoral, at worst). For the bow's history as sign of *xenia* see Murnaghan 1987, 115-116; Ready 2010, 135-136.

(*Odyssey* 21.96-100)

Like Antinous' first attempt to turn the suitors into *hetairoi*, his second attempt is also blameworthy and deserves retribution. The punishment will be absolute: the rouser of *hetairoi* will pay with his life for all their crimes.

Forty lines later, unaware of his fate, Antinous tries one last time to leverage the stirring force of Iliadic *hetaireia* by commanding “all the *hetairoi*” to begin the contest:

ὄρνυσθ' ἐξείης ἐπιδέξια πάντες ἑταῖροι,

ἀρξάμενοι τοῦ χώρου, ὅθεν τέ περ οἶνοχοεῦει.

(*Odyssey* 21.141-142)

This is the only time the suitors are addressed as *hetairoi* in the vocative. If they feel stirred by his address, their confidence in their bow-stringing powers soon disappears. The poet calls attention to their unsoldierly bodies. The suitor Leiodes fails because his hands are soft (*Odyssey* 21.150). Eurymachus laments the suitors' weakness compared with Odysseus (21.254) and perhaps even compared with the beggar (21.327). The poet uses the irony that results from calling them *hetairoi* to glorify Odysseus' military strength, just as he uses the suitors' treacherous *hetaireia* against Telemachus to paint the suitors as dishonorable and evil.

For all his poor *hetaireia*, Antinous at least has military ambitions for the suitor-*hetairoi*. A viler deployment of suitor-*hetaireia* comes in the words of Eurymachus, who insults the beggar in retribution for his critique of Eurymachus' bedmate Melantho:

[Εὐρύμαχος] κερτομέων Ὀδυσῆα· γέλω δ' ἑτάροισιν ἔτευχε·

... ξεῖν', ἧ ἄρ κ' ἐθέλοις θητευέμεν, εἴ σ' ἀνελοίμην,

ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιῇς, – μισθὸς δέ τοι ἄρκιος ἔσται

(*Odyssey* 18.350, 357-358)

After a bizarre jibe apparently mocking the beggar's baldness,⁴² Eurymachus condescendingly offers him a job for pay (μισθός) – the lowest sort of work in the archaic economy. These suitor-*hetairoi* almost evoke fifth-century representations of Alcibiades, asserting their aristocratic superiority and aggressive for irresponsible erotic reasons.⁴³ The extent of Eurymachus' departure from Iliadic *hetaireia* becomes clear in Book 22: when Antinous is dead, Eurymachus blames him for all the suitors' wrongdoing. No Iliadic *hetairos* would turn against a fellow warrior—let alone a central hero—and blame him for collective wrongdoing after the hero is dead.⁴⁴

1.2.3 Mentor the steward and Halitherses the seer: powerless *patrioi hetairoi*

If sailor-*hetairoi* are ephemeral and suitor-*hetairoi* are despicable, the third new type of *hetairoi* in the *Odyssey*—Odysseus' Ithacan *patrioi hetairoi*—are merely ineffectual. The concept of *patrioi hetairoi* is deeply non-Iliadic. Mentor and Halitherses, *hetairoi* to Odysseus and thereby *patrioi hetairoi* to Telemachus, introduce transmission by blood to a relationship

⁴² *Odyssey* 18.354-355: ἔμπης μοι δοκέει δαΐδων σέλας ἔμμεναι αὐτοῦ / κακ κεφαλῆς, ἐπεὶ οὐ οἱ ἐνὶ τρίχες οὐδ' ἦβαιαί. For Odysseus' shining head as an instance of fire imagery see Clarke 1962; for the implied link with Hephaistos see Newton 1987, 15n14.

⁴³ For this parallel see “Conclusions and postscript,” under “Prospective: *hetaireia* and military companionship after Homer.”

⁴⁴ Eurymachus tries to cite Antinous' leadership as defense against Odysseus' attack after Antinous is dead (*Odyssey* 22.48-49: ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἤδη κεῖται, ὃς αἴτιος ἔπλετο πάντων / Ἀντίνοος), but his argument only advances the portrayal of his military inability. In the *Iliad*, of course, the Trojans have a good excuse to blame one of their group separately from the rest, because Paris really did act on his own behalf. But the Trojans reserve such blame for internal discussions, and never use Paris' independence to beg for mercy from the Achaeans.

that, in the *Iliad*, has nothing to do with inheritance.⁴⁵ As the *oikos* comes to dominate the world of Odysseus, even *hetaireia* is absorbed by the family. But this *hetaireia* does the family no good—at least not until a goddess replaces the most trusted of the *patrioi hetairoi*.

Inspired by Athena-Mentes, Telemachus calls the first Ithacan assembly in twenty years (*Odyssey* 2.6-7).⁴⁶ When Telemachus repeats his accusation that the suitors are devouring his family's property, Zeus sends a disturbing omen of two eagles fighting in mid-air (146-154). Zeus' omen is occasion for Homer to introduce the first appearance in epic of *hetairos* modified by *patrios*.

The seer Halitherses is introduced as “old hero” (γέρων ἥρως: *Odyssey* 2.157), but a hundred lines later he and Mentor are described as “paternal *hetairoi*” (Μέντωρ...ἡδ’ Ἀλιθέρσης / οἳ τέ οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρώϊοι εἰσιν ἐταῖροι: 253-254). Halitherses interprets the fighting eagles as a sign that Odysseus will return soon and avenge his household—a dangerously pro-Odysseus prophecy to deliver among the suitors, especially in public. But the most surprising part of his speech is the evidence he offers that his prophecies are coming true:

οὐ γὰρ ἀπείρητος μαντεύομαι, ἀλλ’ ἐὺ εἰδώς·

καὶ γὰρ κείνῳ φημὶ τελευτηθῆναι ἅπαντα,

ὥς οἱ ἐμυθεόμην, ὅτε Ἴλιον εἰσανέβαινον

⁴⁵ The etymology of *hetaireia* may also suggest some semantic pressure against inheritance by blood, insofar as **swe*- sometimes signifies affine rather than blood kinship in other Indo-European languages (Benveniste 1973, book 2, chapter 5); cf. also Chapter 1, under “*Heta(i)r*-: etymology, reference, descriptors.”

⁴⁶ For the vocabulary of groups and individuals in the two Ithacan councils, read Finley-style through the lens of the archaic *polis* and with emphasis on the locus of power, see Julien 2013 (which reads too much later material into the word *demos*), following Beck 2005.

Ἀργεῖοι, μετὰ δέ σφιν ἔβη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς.

φῆν κακὰ πολλὰ παθόντ', ὀλέσαντ' ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους,

ἄγνωστον πάντεσσιν ἐεικοστῷ ἐνιαυτῷ

οἴκαδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι· τὰ δὲ δὴ νῦν πάντα **τελεῖται**.

(*Odyssey* 2.170-176)

Apart from Halitherses' testimony, the assembly does not know whether Odysseus' *hetairoi* are dead. But the Homeric audience knows from the proem, and therefore with certainty, that Odysseus is alone because all his *hetairoi* have destroyed themselves. Moreover, the phrase Halitherses uses to describe Odysseus' dead *hetairoi* (ὀλέσαντ' ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους) becomes a refrain that Odysseus himself repeats eight times, with small variations but always emphatically at the end of the line.⁴⁷ The destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi* is so fixed that its certainty trumps narrative continuity and demonstrates that the *patrios hetairos* Halitherses has true prophetic power.

The suitor Eurymachus silences Halitherses with threats (*Odyssey* 2.178-207), and the prophecy does not persuade anyone that Odysseus is alive. For Telemachus, however, it is enough that Halitherses has suggested the possibility that his father may be alive, and so he proposes the fact-finding mission Athena-Mentes suggested in Book 1. To do this he needs a ship and twenty *hetairoi*:

ἄλλ' ἄγε μοι δότε νῆα θοὴν καὶ εἴκοσ' ἐταίρους,

⁴⁷ *Odyssey* 9.63, 534, 566; 10.134; 11.114; 12.141; 13.340; 23.319.

οἳ κέ μοι ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα διαπρήσσωσι κέλευθον.

εἴμι γὰρ ἐς Σπάρτην τε καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἡμαθόεντα

(*Odyssey* 2.212-214)

The assembly offers no direct response to Telemachus' request. Instead, the first *hetairos* in the *Odyssey* appears:

ἦ τοι ὃ γ' ὥς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο, τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη

Μέντωρ, ὃς ῥ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος ἦεν ἐταῖρος,

καὶ οἱ ἰὼν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐπέτρεπεν οἶκον ἅπαντα,

πεῖθεσθαί τε γέροντι καὶ ἔμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσειν·

(*Odyssey* 2.224-227)

Odysseus had put his *hetairos* Mentor in charge of the *oikos* before he left for Troy. Like Halitherses, Mentor is called *patrios hetairos* in relation to Telemachus (*Odyssey* 2.254)—two cases of paternal *hetaireia* in the Ithacan assembly. Halitherses has just failed to frighten the suitors with his prophecy, but Mentor's failure is far more serious. Odysseus trusted Mentor with the same root (*peith-*) as Iliadic heroes trust their *hetairoi*. Mentor's failure "to protect all the property" (ἐμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσειν), as Odysseus had charged him, is the very problem Telemachus hopes the assembly will solve—the central problem of the second half of the *Odyssey*. Mentor blames the *demos* for failing to overthrow the suitors (νῦν δ' ἄλλω δήμῳ

νεμεσίζομαι: 239), but Leocritus insults him into silence (243-252).⁴⁸ The human Mentor appears no more.

Mentor refuted, the suitors must now defuse Telemachus' apparently reasonable fact-finding proposal. Leocritus does this by conceding to Telemachus the support of his "paternal *hetairoi*," then dismissing this support as fruitless:

τούτῳ δ' ὀτρυνέει Μέντωρ ὁδὸν ἠδ' Ἀλιθέρης,

οἳ τέ οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρώϊοι εἰσιν ἑταῖροι.

ἀλλ', οἶω, καὶ δηθὰ καθήμενος ἀγγελιάων

πεύσεται εἰν Ἰθάκῃ, τελέει δ' ὁδὸν οὐ ποτε ταύτην."

(*Odyssey* 2.253-256)

Leocritus' speech ends the assembly. The people scatter and depart, each to his own home, exactly as Leocritus predicts (*Odyssey* 2.258: οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐσκίδναντο ἐὰ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἕκαστος, very closely paralleling Leocritus' words six lines earlier: λαοὶ μὲν σκίδνασθ' ἐπὶ ἔργα ἕκαστος). The interventions of the two *patrioi hetairoi* have no effect on the intolerable situation.

The concept of "paternal" *hetaireia* is unintelligible in Iliadic terms in four ways. First, paternal *hetaireia* involves, not two parties as in the *Iliad*, but three: the *hetairos*, the individual to whom he is *hetairos*, and the son of the individual to whom he is *hetairos*. Second, this *hetaireia* is heritable; but Iliadic *hetaireia* obtains *de facto* from the shared combat situation, and therefore cannot be inherited by blood. Third, while the only mention of agreed-upon *hetaireia* is

⁴⁸ For Leocritus' speech as the gravest expression of the suitors' blameworthiness in the assembly see Fenik 1974 149-152; for his unparalleled opening insult (ἀταρτηρέ, φρένας ἤλεέ) as a means of characterization see Race 1993, 85.

entirely one-sided and voluntary,⁴⁹ the paternal *hetaireia* of the *Odyssey* is lexically and legally very close to institutionalization within the Ithacan community, insofar as paternal *hetaireia* is inherited and can even be invoked in assembly. Fourth, while non-military *hetaireia* is impossible in the setting of the *Iliad*, the relationship signified by “*patrioi hetairoi*” is only one of four types of non-military *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey*. In fact, both of the paternal *hetairoi* in this assembly are related to Odysseus in specifically non-military capacities. Halistheres is a seer who prophesies about, rather than fights in, the Trojan war; and Odysseus entrusts his property to Mentor because this *hetairos* does not sail to Troy.

1.2.4 Eumaius and his slave-*hetairoi*

Suitors and sailors are not warriors, but they are from the warrior class. Steward-*hetairos* and seer-*hetairos* are not warriors either, but only because they are in no condition or circumstance to fight effectively. But the fourth type of Ithacan *hetairoi* can never be warriors. Eumaius’ *hetairoi* are swineherds and slaves. They act as companions successfully, but only in a pastoral setting. Swineherd-*hetaireia* thus represents a new type of *hetaireia*: an occupational sort of association, anticipated by Telemachus’ rower-*hetairoi*.

The first usage of ‘*hetairoi*’ referring to men who are not even members of the warrior class appears at *Odyssey* 14.407, when Eumaius calls to his fellow swineherds to help give the stranger hospitality:

νῦν δ’ ὄρη δόρποιο· τάχιστα μοι ἔνδον ἑταῖροι

εἶεν, ἴν’ ἐν κλισίῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον.

⁴⁹ Idomeneus at *Iliad* 4.265-271, discussed in Chapter 2, under “Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans.”

(*Odyssey* 14.407-408)

Eumaius asks his *hetairoi* to provide food for the stranger, but this is not a degrading kind of service. The passage echoes *Iliad* 9.202-204, where Achilles tells Patroclus *hetairos* to provide food for Agamemnon's delegation. Eumaius' *hetaireia* is Iliadic in another way: these herdsmen are called *hetairoi* just when they offer support to someone in need. At the moment Odysseus begins to receive help from his slave, the word '*hetairos*' comes to refer to fellow-slaves, swineherd-companions, rather than the warrior-companions signified by '*hetairos*' in the *Iliad*.

It is no accident that Eumaius is the only slave with *hetairoi*. As Odysseus will learn in the next book, Eumaius was born a prince.⁵⁰ As an infant he was kidnapped and sold into slavery (*Odyssey* 15.400-484). His sufferings parallel Odysseus' (as Odysseus himself feels at 486-492), just as his royal blood allows him to converse with Odysseus as a peer. Unlike Odysseus, Eumaius has accepted his current place in life, preferring Odysseus' household even to the *oikos* of his father and mother (14.139-144). The poet has his class-structure both ways: he concedes *hetaireia* only to the sole slave of noble birth, but also makes that slave happier under Odysseus' rule than in his own land.

The unmilitary character of swineherd-*hetaireia* appears when Odysseus addresses Eumaius' *hetairoi* with the *otrun-* root, as heroes regularly address warrior-*hetairoi*:

τοῖς δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς μετέειπε, συβώτεω πειρητίζων,

⁵⁰ For the significance of Eumaius' birth see Kirk 1962, 367-368 (the lifestyle of a slave has made his noble birth irrelevant) Finley 1978, 53; Rose 1992, 110-111 (the possibility of a royally-born slave problematizes the socioeconomic concept of *aristoi*); Olson 1995, chapter 6; *contra* Loudon 2001, 65, suggesting that Eumaius' status might weigh against an exclusively aristocratic performance context (but his birth is noble). For the edifying rhetoric of Eumaius' tale see Minchin 1992 (Odysseus' lack of surprise at Eumaius' noble birth confirms that appearances can be deceptive). For general depiction of slaves in the *Odyssey* see Thalmann 1998, 49-103.

εἴ πως οἱ ἐκδὺς χλαῖναν πόροι ἢ τιν' ἐταίρων

ἄλλον ἐποτρύνειεν, ἐπεὶ ἐο κήδετο λίην·

κέκλυθι νῦν, Εὐμαίε καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐταῖροι,

εὐξάμενός τι ἔπος ἐρέω·

(*Odyssey* 14.459-463)

These *hetairoi* are not warriors, but they are like Iliadic *hetairoi* in one way: Odysseus wants to see how these slave-*hetairoi* will support a stranger in need. The support he requires is physical, but it is not military, and so the role of the “nearby helper,” signified in a military context by ‘*hetairoi*’ in the *Iliad*, is filled in the *Odyssey* by non-warrior *hetairoi*, who give him what he needs without requiring him to ask. In this respect, Eumaius’ swineherd-*hetairoi* act, and accordingly are treated, more like Iliadic *hetairoi* than Odysseus’ *hetairoi* have been. But the support Odysseus needs—a warm cloak—belongs on the peacetime estate, not the battlefield. The bond between leader Eumaius and swineherd-*hetairoi* is confirmed by Eumaius’ ability to speak on behalf of his *hetairoi* when Odysseus tests them again:

τοῖς δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς μετέειπε, **συνώτεω πειρητίζων,**

ἢ μιν ἔτ' ἐνδυκέως φιλέοι μεῖναι τε κελεύοι

αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ σταθμῷ ἢ ὀτρύνειε πόλινδε·

κέκλυθι νῦν, **Εὐμαίε, καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐταῖροι**

ἠῶθεν προτὶ ἄστρ' ἀποπέεσθαι

πτωχεύσων, **ἵνα μὴ σε κατατρύχω καὶ ἐταίρους.**

(*Odyssey* 15.304-309)

The guest wishes not to outstay his welcome, but Odysseus is doing more than merely following the etiquette of *xenia*.⁵¹ Just as he earlier tests Eumaius' response to a stranger in need, here he tests the extent and longevity of Eumaius' loyalty.⁵² If the swineherds do not come with him to the palace, they are merely good servants of *xenia*. If they do come with him, then they are something more: they will prove to be committed supporters in the battle to come.⁵³ Odysseus needs more than hospitality; he needs loyalty against the threatening suitors, the kind of loyalty warrior-*hetairoi* have for Iliadic kings.

On the one hand, then, slaves have *hetairoi* but they are not *hetairoi* of the king; and, on the other, these slaves are practically the only humans, besides family, who have remained loyal to the king. But *xenia* for a beggar is one thing; military support for a hero in battle is quite another. As long as they offer only *xenia*, slaves cannot replace Odysseus' *hetairoi*.

2. Odysseus' new allies

As *hetairoi* become something other than warrior-companions, warrior-companions become something other than *hetairoi*. Post-Thrinakian *hetairoi* are suitors, sailors, stewards, seers, and slaves; post-Thrinakian warrior-companions are family and slaves—and one goddess, the only member of Odysseus' Ithacan band who is actually called Odysseus' *hetairos*.

⁵¹ For Eumaius' superb hospitality see Stanford 1965, 233; Murnaghan 1987, 108; Reece 1993, chapter 7.

⁵² For Odysseus' and Eumaius' mutual testing and resulting growth in mutual affection see Rose 1980, building on Austin 1975 (esp. 167-169 and 203-204). See also Roisman 1990 (cautious self-disclosure and recognition from Odysseus and Eumaius, respectively).

⁵³ For Odysseus' desire to recruit Eumaius for battle see Eisenberger 1973, 16-18.

The new Odyssean division of warrior-companions into mortal and immortal parallels a new split between the two basic ways Iliadic warrior-companions relate to the hero. In the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* provide both physical and moral support. They give battle and courage, and lamentation when death comes to *hetairoi* notwithstanding. Odysseus, too, receives both physical and moral support in battle against the suitors and their families. But the sources of each kind of support vary by nature. Physical support comes from mortal, human non-*hetairoi* whose relation to Odysseus is proper to the *oikos*: family (Telemachus, Laertes) and slaves (Eumaius, Philoitios, Dolius and sons) physically fight and kill enemies in battle. Moral support comes from an immortal, non-human *hetairos*: Athena-Mentor fights in the *Odyssey* primarily by psychological means and gives Odysseus courage that his mortal supporters cannot.

2.1 Human non-*hetairoi*

2.1.1 Telemachus the warrior-son

Telemachus opens *Odyssey* 1 as a boy seeking an absent father and closes *Odyssey* 21 as his father's mightiest warrior-companion. The maturation of Telemachus is usually treated as a kind of *Bildung*, his growth as a man and son of a great father.⁵⁴ But while Telemachus does

⁵⁴ Analysts (Kirchoff 1859; Bekker 1863; Wilamowitz 1927, 99-127; Schadewaldt 1958, 327-332) take the prolegomenal character of the Telemachy as evidence of its interpolation, but this argument is persuasively refuted by Scott 1918 on the grounds that the Telemachy gives "the proper setting for grasping the greatness of Odysseus." Scott is correct, but the maturation of Telemachus is just as crucial for the climax of the *Odyssey* as the glorification of Odysseus himself (Miller and Carmichael 1954; Clarke 1967, 30-44; Rose 1967; Austin 1969; Apthorp 1980; Jones 1988; Beck 1998; Heath 2001; Duval 2011). Other poetic functions of the Telemachy include: excuse for other *nostoi* (Woodhouse 1930, 209; Kirk 1962, 356); excuse to include Helen (Woodhouse 1930, 209); opportunity for the suitors to ambush Telemachus treacherously, thereby justifying Odysseus' slaughter (Delebecque 1958, 137); deeper characterization of Odysseus through the words of his Homeric peers (Scott 1918, 420-421); offering Telemachus as model of internal audience (Martin 1993, 239); initiation of Telemachus into adulthood (Clarke 1967, 31-32; refined in Renaud 2002, which presents Telemachus' development as a limited type of initiation, contrasted with his father's full initiation, which includes both brilliant display of physical prowess against a wild boar and successful journey to and return from the underworld). Against the claim that Telemachus actually matures over the course of the Telemachy, see most notably Wilamowitz 1927, 106 (*contra*: what remains static are simply features of personality, while Telemachus' actions – which show character more than features of personality, as

become his father's peer, he does not become his father's replacement. Telemachus belongs to his father's faction and is not Odysseus' rival. The son belongs, not in his father's place, but at his side.

This outcome is unexpected. The suitors see Telemachus only as his father's son.⁵⁵ Telemachus sees himself only as his father's son, if even that.⁵⁶ Eurykleia and Penelope see him as his father's son, and so do most commentators. But when Telemachus actually meets Odysseus, their conversation is not about the relationship between father and son. On the contrary: Athena tells Odysseus to reveal himself to his son in order that the two of them may plan for battle against the suitors:

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,

ἤδη νῦν σὼ παιδὶ ἔπος φάο μῆδ' ἐπίκευθε,

ὥς ἂν μνηστῆρσιν θάνατον καὶ κῆρ' ἀραρόντε

Aristotle notes – change considerably; see Austin 1969, 45 and Olson 1995, chapter four). See also Roisman 1994 for poetic techniques used to compare and contrast Telemachus and Odysseus from the Telemachy through Book 24; Gottesman 2014, following Peradotto 1990, 117-118; Pucci 1987, 201-208; Olson 1995, 64-90; Wöhrle 1999. Murnaghan 2002 points out that Telemachus' maturation cannot climax in his own kingship because his father (unlike his grandfather) must be restored as king. For a recent bibliographical review see Nancy Duval's 2011 dissertation (*paideia*: 19-41; initiation: 41-67).

It is worth noting that, in other instances of the folk-motif of the suitors' plot against the missing hero's son (assembled in Alden 1987), the heir is an infant (Homeric νήπιος; Edmunds 1990; Heath 2001, 131-133, esp. 131n6), too young to fight at his father's side; thus, as Alden observes, the growth of Telemachus from helplessness to martial maturity allows Homer to combine the motif of the suitors' attempt to kill the heir (where Telemachus is victim, as he seems when the suitors plot to ambush him on his return) with the motif of the blood feud (where Telemachus is his father's greatest military asset besides Athena).

⁵⁵ The suitors also think that Telemachus wants to build his own warrior-band as he ventures to find news of his father (*Odyssey* 2.325-330).

⁵⁶ *Odyssey* 1.215-216: μήτηρ μὲν τέ μέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε / οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἐὼν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.

ἔρχησθον προτὶ ἄστν περικλυτόν· οὐδ' ἐγὼ αὐτὴ

δηρὸν ἀπὸ σφῶϊν ἔσομαι μεμαυῖα μάχεσθαι.

(*Odyssey* 16.167-171)

The first meeting between father and son is a conversation between military commanders. The *Odyssey* poet follows a thirty-five line reunion (*Odyssey* 16.187-220) with a hundred-line council of war (221-321). And it is Telemachus, not Odysseus, who ends their otherwise endless weeping:

καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἠελίοιο,

εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα·

(*Odyssey* 16.220-221)

Telemachus asks Odysseus how he has reached Ithaca, just as he had asked Athena-Mentes how she arrived on Ithaca in Book 1 (everything not underlined is repeated verbatim):

ὀπποίης τ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο; πῶς δέ σε ναῦται

ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;

οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν ὁῖομαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι.

(*Odyssey* 1.171-173: Telemachus to Mentes)

ποίη γὰρ νῦν δεῦρο, πάτερ φίλε, νηῖ σε ναῦται

ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;

[οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν ὁῖομαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι.]

(*Odyssey* 16.222-224: Telemachus to Odysseus)

Telemachus' expectation of Odysseus' return, frustrated in Book 1, is satisfied in Book 16. But another hope remains unfulfilled. Just as Athena-Mentes appears with no companions to carry her over the sea, so Odysseus returns with no companions to fight against the suitors. Father and son are each the other's only allies in battle. Both have already quietly hinted at the unique trustworthiness of kin in battle:

ἢ τι [οὔτε] κασιγνήτοισ' ἐπιμέμφεαι, οἷσί περ ἀνὴρ

μαρναμένοισι πέποιθε, καὶ εἰ μέγα νεῖκος ὄρηται;

(*Odyssey* 16.97-98: Odysseus to Telemachus)

= 16.115-116: Telemachus agreeing with Odysseus)

And in reply to Telemachus' query, a surprisingly terse Odysseus narrates his return in seven lines—and then focuses on the bloody business at hand:

νῦν αὖ δεῦρ' ἰκόμην ὑποθημοσύνησιν Ἀθήνης,

ὄφρα κε δυσμενέεσσι φόνου **πέρι βουλευόμεν**

ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι μνηστῆρας ἀριθμήσας κατάλεξον,

ὄφρ' εἰδέω, **ὅσσοι τε καὶ οἵ τινες ἄνδρες εἰσί·**

καὶ κεν ἐμὸν κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα μερμηρίζας

φράσσομαι, ἢ κεν νῶϊ δυνησόμεθ' ἀντιφέρεσθαι

μόυνω ἄνευθ' ἄλλων, ἢ καὶ διζησόμεθ' ἄλλους.

(*Odyssey* 16.233-239)

Father and son, Odysseus says, will plan the assault together (φόνου περί βουλευόμεν) and may even fight the suitors alone (μούνω ἄνευθ' ἄλλων). But Telemachus knows better, and, as if in response to Leocritus' appeal to the suitors' numerical superiority, he is the first to suggest that the two of them expand their band:

...οὐδέ κεν εἴη

ἄνδρε δύω πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι μάχεσθαι.

μνηστήρων δ' οὐτ' ἄρ' δεκάς ἀτρεκέες οὔτε δύ' οἶαι,

ἀλλὰ πολὺ πλέονες...

(*Odyssey* 16.243-246)

Telemachus, better than Odysseus, grasps the military situation from a human perspective. The suitors are too many for the two of them to fight. But Odysseus, more than Telemachus, appreciates the power of divine support:

τοιγὰρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μευ ἄκουσον,

καὶ φράσαι, ἥ κεν **νοῶν** Ἀθήνη σὺν Διὶ πατρὶ

ἀρκέσει, ἥέ τιν' ἄλλον ἀμύντορα μερμηρίζω...

οὐ μέν τοι κείνω γε πολὺν χρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔσεσθον

φυλόπιδος κρατερῆς, ὅποτε μνηστήρσι καὶ ἡμῖν

ἐν μεγάροισιν ἐμοῖσι μένος κρίνηται Ἄρηος.

(*Odyssey* 16.259-261; 267-269)

Telemachus agrees (*Odyssey* 16.263-265). To Telemachus' human support, soon expanded to include two slaves, Odysseus adds the divine support of two Olympian gods. The dual mortal-immortal constitution of the post-Thrinakian military group is thus explicitly presented in Odysseus' and Telemachus' joint plan for battle.

The reunion-turned-war-council presents Telemachus as Odysseus' peer. But Odysseus' other peers have become his potential replacements—both mutinous *hetairoi* on Odysseus' ships and Penelope-wooing suitors in Odysseus' home. If Telemachus is not to become a peer *qua* potential substitute, then, like a good warrior-companion, his strength and his allegiance must never flag. In a single act Telemachus demonstrates that they never will:

τρίς μὲν μιν πελέμιξεν ἐρύσσεσθαι μενεαίνων,

τρίς δὲ μεθῆκε βίης, ἐπιελπόμενος τό γε θυμῷ,

νευρὴν ἐντανύειν διοῖστέυσειν τε σιδήρου.

καί νύ κε δὴ ἐτάνυσσε βίη τὸ τέταρτον ἀνέλκων,

ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀνένευε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἰέμενόν περ.

(*Odyssey* 21.125-129)

Where suitor-*hetairoi* are too weak to ready the hero's weapon, the son (and non-*hetairos*) is perhaps strong enough.⁵⁷ But despite his own personal desire (ἰέμενόν περ) Telemachus obeys even a wordless nod from his father and king.

⁵⁷ For bibliography on this scene note 40 above.

The physical support offered by the prince is encapsulated at the moment Odysseus is finally ready to kill the domestic invaders. Book 21 ends with an image of Telemachus as both offspring of his father and warrior at the side of the king:

ἦ, καὶ ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσεν· ὁ δ' ἀμφέθετο ξίφος ὀξὺ

Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θεϊοῖο,

ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖρα φίλην βάλεν ἔγχεϊ, ἄγχι δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ

παρ θρόνον ἐστήκει κεκορυθμένος αἶθοπι χαλκῷ.

(*Odyssey* 21.431-434)

In a single sentence Telemachus is beloved son (φίλος υἱός), next to (ἄγχι) his father, beside the throne (παρ θρόνον), with sword and spear at the ready. Military force and subordination to the order of *oikos* are vivid in equal measure.⁵⁸

2.1.2 Laertes the warrior-father

At the beginning of *Odyssey* 1, Laertes has less hope than Telemachus.⁵⁹ Telemachus wants the suitors dead and the royal marriage restored, and he is young enough to believe, at a spur from his father's *xenos* Mentès, that both aims are within reach. Telemachus is supported by Athena-Mentès, who spurs him to hope for the suitors' expulsion, and Athena-Mentor, who sends him on a sea voyage to find news of his father. He naturally contributes to his father's battle-plan because both men are already seeking the same thing. But Laertes is old, his warrior

⁵⁸ As Aristotle notes (*Poetics* 1459b24), this scene is a profoundly climactic recognition-scene, a long-prepared revelation of Odysseus' (and also Telemachus') true identity.

⁵⁹ *Odyssey* 1.189-190: ...Λαέρτην ἥρωα, τὸν οὐκέτι φασὶ πόλινδε / ἔρχεσθ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ πῆματα πάσχειν.

days apparently behind him, and he has received no such visit from a god. He believes his son is dead and hopes for nothing. The *Odyssey* poet describes little about Laertes save for his depression, briefly in Book 1 (188-191) and at greater length (and very movingly) in Book 24.⁶⁰ What Laertes needs is not direction, as Telemachus receives from Athena, but rather hope that his son is safe. Sheer return is not enough; after he recognizes Odysseus (*Odyssey* 24.345-345), Laertes' heart is immediately filled with dread.⁶¹

Like Telemachus in book 16, Laertes' first words to Odysseus are tactical:

νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα, μὴ τάχα πάντες

ἐνθάδ' ἐπέλθωσιν Ἰθακῆσιοι, ἀγγελίας δὲ

πάντη ἐποτρύνωσι Κεφαλλήνων πολίεσσι.

(*Odyssey* 24.352-355)

For a second time in the *Odyssey*, the reunion of father and son is immediately transformed into a council of war. Odysseus quickly tells his father not to worry (θάρσει· μή τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ

⁶⁰ The possibility that *Odyssey* 24 may have been considered spurious by Aristophanes and Aristarchus first appears in a scholium to *Odyssey* 23.295-296. For detailed treatment of this scholium, along with the supposed parallel between *Odyssey* 23.296 and the last line of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, see Moulton 1974, 153-157 (with extensive bibliography); Seaford 1994, 38-42; and especially Erbse 1972, 166-244 (including an interesting counter-reading on pages 174-177 that the scholium merely indicates that the Aristotelian plot ends with the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope, and that the Alexandrians did not reject all of Book 24, on the evidence that 23.310-314 and 24.1-204 were separately athetized, idly if everything after 23.296 were spurious). For linguistic peculiarities in book 24, used by Analysts and Neo-analysts to reject the entire book, see Merkelbach 1951, 142-155; Page 1955, 101-136; Kirk 1962, 248-251; Lesky 1967, 130-132; Schadewaldt 1970, 70. But see Erbse 1972, 177-229 and Wender 1978 for detailed refutation, with larger bibliography on the literary role of *Odyssey* 24 as an argument in favor of inclusion at Moulton 1974, 154n7.

⁶¹ On Laertes in the *Odyssey* see Scodel 1998, 9-16; for Laertes as symbolically dead, then revived by Odysseus and Athena, see Sels 2013.

σῆσι μελόντων: *Odyssey* 24.357). But Odysseus had already raised the military issue, in the speech in which he first stopped testing his father and admitting to being Laertes' son:

κεῖνος μὲν δὴ ὅδ' αὐτὸς ἐγώ, πάτερ, ὃν σὺ μεταλλάξ,

ἦλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

ἀλλ' ἴσχευ κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε δακρυόεντος.

ἐκ γάρ τοι ἐρέω· μάλα δὲ χρὴ σπευδέμεν ἔμπης·

μνηστῆρας κατέπεφνον ἐν ἡμετέροισι δόμοισι

λώβην τεινύμενος θυμαλγέα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα.

(*Odyssey* 24.321-326)

Homer does not say exactly what Odysseus is testing about Laertes, but the need for swift action is clearly on his mind.⁶² Whatever his conscious intent, Odysseus found an ally in battle when he sought his father in the fields. As if to confirm Laertes' prowess, when Athena glorifies his appearance, he presents himself to his son as a royal warrior and wishes he could have fought against the suitors at his son's side (*Odyssey* 24.376-382).

⁶² On Odysseus' obscure (and possibly cruel) motivations see especially see Woolsey 1941, 175 (Odysseus is not certain that Laertes' sorrow is genuine); Focke 1943, 378 (Odysseus cannot help but test everyone he encounters; similarly Stanford 1955, 60); Lord 1960, 176-179 (citing parallel examples in other oral poetry of pointless lies told to relatives by returning heroes); Fenik 1974, 47-53 (unnecessary characterization of Odysseus as a trickster); Heubeck 1981, 73 (with bibliography); de Jong 2009, 73 (Odysseus wants recognition as son, in parallel to earlier recognitions as son, husband, master, and king); Walcot 2009, 152-153 (imitation and inversion of the common modern Greek habit of lying to children in order to teach them to be clever and skeptical). Scodel 1998, 9-16, correctly in my view, interprets Odysseus' "trial" as an attempt to rouse Laertes for battle (unsuccessful until Athena intervenes).

Laertes' is the decisive spear-throw in Book 24, even though his and Dolius' grey hairs make them warriors only by necessity.⁶³ But the strength of the spear-throw comes from Athena-Mentor, just before the suitors' families are finally routed. Her exhortation is a command to her "dearest of *hetairoi*" to pray to Athena and Zeus:

ὦ Ἀρκεισιάδῃ, πάντων πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων,

εὐξάμενος κούρῃ γλαυκώπιδι καὶ Διὶ πατρί,

αἶψα μάλ' ἀμπεπαλὼν προΐει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος.

ὥς φάτο, καὶ ῥ' ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα Παλλὰς Ἀθήνῃ.

(*Odyssey* 24.517-520)

In the last mention of *hetairoi* in Homer, Athena expresses *hetaireia* between the king's father and herself; in the same breath she gives him strength (μένος) to win the final battle. Laertes' throw, in turn, is the last act of warfighting in Homer. "Praying to the daughter of Zeus" (εὐξάμενος δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλῳ: *Odyssey* 24.521), he casts his spear and kills Eupheithes (522-524). The battle is effectively over, the *oikos* secure, enemies incapable of further resistance. Athena and Zeus close the *Odyssey*, not by protecting their favorites from their enemies, but by protecting their enemies from their favorites. The military parallel between father and son is strong: as Odysseus kills Antinous, leader of the suitors, in Book 22, so Odysseus' father kills Eupheithes, Antinous' father and leader of the rebel forces, in Book 24. The last pretenders are finally defeated, not by Odysseus, but by Odysseus' family—Athena's *hetairoi*.

⁶³ *Odyssey* 24.498-499: ἐν δ' ἄρα Λαέρτης Δολίος τ' ἐς τεύχε' ἔδυνον / καὶ πολλοὶ περ ἐόντες, ἀναγκαῖοι πολεμισταί.

2.1.3 Eumaius, Philoitios, Dolius and sons: warrior-slaves

It is unsurprising that Odysseus' son and father should support him in battle, although it is striking how quickly after reunion all three generations' thoughts turn to war. More surprising is the role of slaves in both final battles. For it is not enough that Eumaius and Philoitios should fight against the suitors. To the battle against the suitors' families the *Odyssey* poet adds the aged Dolius and his four sons. Dolius' name itself suggests "slave," even if the derivation is not accurate.⁶⁴

No mortal is Odysseus' *hetairos* during battle, but Odysseus promises that Eumaius and Philoitios will become Telemachus' *hetairoi* if the battle goes well. The replacement of human warrior-*hetaireia* with a different kind of mortal companionship is complete when Odysseus offers to make swineherd and cowherd into *hetairoi* for their service in battle:

εἴ χ' ὑπ' ἐμοί γε θεὸς δαμάσῃ μνηστῆρας ἀγανούς,

ἄξομαι ἀμφοτέροισ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματ' ὀπάσσω

οἰκία τ' ἐγγυὲς ἐμεῖο τετυγμένα· καὶ **μοι ἔπειτα**

Τηλεμάχου ἐτάρῳ τε κασιγνήτῳ τε ἔσεσθον.

(*Odyssey* 21.213-216)

In one breath Odysseus promises the slaves freedom, property, marriage, *hetaireia*, and kinship. This new kind of *hetaireia* entails practices of the *oikos*, as mediated by the largesse of the king. Even the crucible of combat cannot make slaves into *oikos-hetairoi* without the formal grant of

⁶⁴ For survey of scholarly opinions see Haller 2013 264n2. Haller concludes that Dolius' name is probably from *dolos*, "trick," because *doulos* probably derives from Mycenaean *dohelos*, but correctly notes that Homer employs etymological wordplay (citing Peradotto 1990, 94-95, 102-104; O'Hara 1996; and Louden 1995).

the king. In Iliadic terms, it would be nonsense that someone should grant *hetaireia*, a relationship generated in battle. But just as the concept of the *patrios hetairos* signifies the subordination of *hetaireia* to inheritance, the possibility of royally granted *hetaireia*, together with the possibility of royally granted kinship (κασιγνήτω),⁶⁵ signifies the subordination of *hetaireia* to the power of the father-king.⁶⁶

2.2 Athena *hetairos*

The thesis of the final section of this chapter is that the bond between Odysseus and Athena in the *Odyssey* is both a new kind of *hetaireia* and also a new kind of relationship between humans and gods. Athena is called *hetairos* because she gives Odysseus courage and joy. Her disguises on Ithaca suggest a shift from reciprocity to intimacy: at first Mentēs *xenos*, she becomes Mentor *hetairos*. Her support is psychological: she makes Odysseus, Penelope, Telemachus, and Laertes look beautiful and strong, and she intervenes in battle only to boost morale (for which Odysseus' human supporters are not sufficient). She has a twofold mission, to return Odysseus home and to verify Zeus' theodicy. Both are advanced by the disappearance of human *hetaireia* and the introduction of *hetaireia* between Odysseus and Athena.

Athena's *hetaireia* with mortals has two degrees of intimacy, corresponding to the two contexts in which she relates to mortals as *hetairos*. First, she regularly appears as Mentor, the *hetairos* to whom Odysseus had entrusted all his possession during the expedition to Troy.

⁶⁵ For Eumaios and Eurykleia as kin or quasi-kin to the royal family see Richter 1968, 22-23 and Murnaghan 1987, 39-42, discussed in Thalmann 1998, 88n102.

⁶⁶ Donlan 1973, 153 takes this companionship between king and slaves as evidence of a peasant's perspective in the narrative, but attributes the bond to "intrinsic worth" rather than physical support in battle (as this passage makes explicit). Thalmann 1998, 86-88 calls the possibility of companionship with "good slaves" a "contradiction," but again the analysis focuses too narrowly on status ("good" or "helper") rather than the life-risking action (fighting at the king's side) for which Odysseus himself promises the slaves *hetaireia*.

Second, she presents herself as a divine alternative to a mortal *hetairos*: once as an anonymous supporter (*Odyssey* 8.200) and once as a more deserving object of trust than any mortal *hetairos*, thanks to her superior knowledge (20.45). The first kind of *hetaireia* binds Athena to the entire royal family, insofar as Athena-Mentor gives strength and support to all three royal males individually.⁶⁷ The second kind binds Athena to Odysseus alone, as a private source of courage when physical support alone is not enough. Moreover, while she retains her disguise as Mentor in the sight of Laertes and Telemachus (who sometimes nevertheless realize that she is a goddess), she reveals herself openly to Odysseus and cares about whether he trusts her as much as she deserves.

In sum, Athena is a new kind of *hetairos* in four ways. First, Athena is Odysseus' only *hetairos* after his human *hetairoi* destroy themselves.⁶⁸ Second, in a remarkable departure from the *Iliad*, Athena in the *Odyssey* is not explicitly described as specifically affecting the trajectories of weapons in battle; rather, she turns the course of battle by altering morale.⁶⁹ Third, it seems confusing that Athena's first two disguises should have names so similar, both from the same *men-* root; but the similarity in name points to a difference in relation, for the first disguise belongs to Odysseus' *xenos* and the second to his *hetairos*. Fourth, *Odyssey* 24 ends with a description of Athena's appearance as Mentor, an exact repetition of her first appearance as Mentor to Telemachus in *Odyssey* 2 and of her recent appearance to Odysseus in the battle

⁶⁷ For the link between Athena and royal families in a general Greek religious context see Burkert 1985, 139-143.

⁶⁸ If a band of loyal Ithacan warriors formed around Odysseus in other versions of his return, as Lord 1960, 181 suggests, then the absence of human *hetairoi* on Ithaca signifies a deliberate choice by the *Odyssey* poet (or some predecessor in the oral tradition). See Haller 2013 for recent review of the (somewhat thin) internal evidence.

⁶⁹ At *Odyssey* 22.257-259 and 275-278, the suitors' throws strike the roof and doorway – presumably the effect of Athena's intervention – but the spears are the subjects of the active verbs βάλλω and πίπτω. The *Odyssey* poet avoids narrating Athena's corporeal agency directly. See discussion below under "Psychological warfare: Athena's new role in battle and the autonomy of morale."

against the suitors.⁷⁰ Athena-*qua*-Mentor appears for the last time just as both human and divine conflicts are resolved—as war on the human level ends with Laertes’ spear-throw, inspired by Athena-Mentor’s appeal to him as “dearest of *hetairoi*,” and discord on the divine level ends with Zeus telling Athena to do “do whatever [her] mind wishes” (ἔρξον ὅπῃ δὴ τοι νόος ἔπλετο: *Odyssey* 24.285).

2.2.1 *Xenos to hetairos: Mentos to Mentor*

The *Odyssey* begins and ends with Athena appearing under the *men*- root.⁷¹ Mentos is Athena’s first disguise; Mentor is her last. Athena-Mentos begins the action of the *Odyssey* by inspiring Odysseus’ son to call an assembly and find his father; Athena-Mentor ends the action of the *Odyssey* by inspiring Odysseus’ father to kill Eupheides and then restraining the royal band from massacring the entire enemy force. Telemachus opens the first crack in the suitors’ domination with the *menos* of Athena-Mentos; Laertes puts the last touches on the suitors’ defeat with the *menos* of Athena-Mentor.

The similarity between Mentos and Mentor has confused interpreters since Noemon the suitor.⁷² The root *men*- is evidently connected with Athena’s role in cult,⁷³ her literary function in

⁷⁰ Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν: *Odyssey* 24.548=24.503=22.206=2.268=2.401.

⁷¹ The root is possibly shared with *menis*, the theme-word of the *Iliad* (see Watkins 1977; Considine 1984; Muellner 1996, with bibliographical survey of etymology at 184-190). Thus in a linguistic sense mind replaces rage; or more precisely, the domain of the *men*- root becomes mental rather than physical. This seems suited to the changing settings: victory in the Odyssean *oikos* comes with invincible mind, as victory on the Iliadic battlefield comes with invincible rage. For the *men* as a phonetic vehicle used by Homer to hint at a connection between Mentos/Mentor and Telemachus’ *menos* see Dimock 1989, 25-30. Cook (2015, 19) translates both Mentos and Mentor as “Mr. Agent of *Menos*.”

⁷² That Athena’s choice of disguise is significant is further implied by the riskiness of appearing specifically as a second Mentor—as Clay 1984, 17 notes, citing a suspecting Noemon at *Odyssey* 4.653-656. Unlike Mentos, the non-divine Mentor is a regular presence in the royal household, presumably a potential source of annoyance to the suitors (given his charge over Odysseus’ household) even before Telemachus’ assembly in book 2.

⁷³ Delebecque 1958; Herington 1963; Cook 1995.

the *Odyssey*, and her favoritism toward Odysseus. But one of the two disguises is bound more strongly to Odysseus than the other. Mentos is Odysseus' *xenos* (*Odyssey* 1.187) while Mentor is Odysseus' *hetairos* (2.225). As Mentos in Book 1, Athena's aid to Telemachus is less direct: she simply tells him that Odysseus is still alive (1.187). As Mentor in Book 2, her aid is more concrete: she gathers twenty *hetairoi* for Telemachus' expedition to Pylos and Sparta. At the end of the poem, again as Mentor, her aid to Laertes explicitly ties victory to nothing but divine aid: she does nothing but exhort him to pray to Athena and Zeus.⁷⁴ The final state of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* thus encodes intimacy with the gods on two levels. First, the goddess herself comes in the form of a paternal *hetairos*. Second, an exhortation to prayer is sufficient to grant strength for battle. Athena breathes might into Laertes and his spear flies true (522-525).⁷⁵

The difference between Mentos and Mentor is signified by the difference between *xenos* and *hetairos* but actualized by the difference between the effects of Athena-Mentos and the effects of Athena-Mentor. For all the courage and assertiveness Telemachus displays after Athena-Mentos' morale-boosting intervention, the assembly he calls is a failure. Nothing is resolved; even within the assembly, Telemachus receives support only from Halitherses and Mentor, his *patrioi hetairoi*. But as Leocritus points out to close the assembly, these two old men cannot help him. Like Achilles after the disastrous assembly in *Iliad* 1, Telemachus needs the help of a god. The god comes in the form of the steward-*hetairos*. As Telemachus prays for help on the seashore,⁷⁶ the ineffectual human *patrios hetairos* Mentor is replaced by Athena:

⁷⁴ Her exhortation to sworn peace is also a rejection of bloodshed: ἴσχεσθε πτολέμου, Ἰθακήσιοι, ἀργαλέον, / ὥς κεν ἀναιμῶτί γε διακρινθῇτε τάχιστα (*Odyssey* 24.531-532).

⁷⁵ For the final fight as fulfilling promises given in many earlier passages see Wender 1978, 63.

⁷⁶ The scene resembles Achilles' request for help from Thetis in *Iliad* 1 (Τηλέμαχος δ' ἀπάνευθε κιὼν ἐπὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης, / χεῖρας νηψάμενος πολὺς ἄλός, εὔχετ' Ἀθήνη: *Odyssey* 2.260-261). The seashore setting is the same; the

ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη,

Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν...⁷⁷

(*Odyssey* 2.267-268)

It is not merely the facts that Athena is disguised as Mentor, and that Mentor is Odysseus' *hetairos*, that encode the replacement of human *hetaireia* with divine aid. Rather, in Athena's response to Telemachus' prayer, she explicitly attributes her intervention to *hetaireia* with Odysseus:

τοῖος γάρ **τοὶ ἐταῖρος ἐγὼ πατρώϊός εἰμι**,

ὅς τοι νῆα θοὴν στελέω καὶ ἄμ' ἔψομαι αὐτός.

(*Odyssey* 2.286-287)

The surface-level *descriptum* of ἐταῖρος πατρώϊος is of course Mentor. But what Athena attributes to Mentor's *hetaireia*, she herself actually does.

Forty lines earlier the human Mentor was first introduced as Odysseus' *hetairos* (*Odyssey* 2.225) – the first *hetairos* named in the *Odyssey*. The form of Athena-Mentor has two meanings, kept distinct by the successive introduction of two disguises. First, Mentor has something to do with mind (*men-*), in keeping with both Athena's and Odysseus' natures – but so does Mentēs.

moment in the plot is similar – a major hero in the right is thwarted by a group larger than his; as a result his portion is taken away from him; he has no recourse but to the gods. But where Achilles' divine addressee was his mother, Telemachus' divine addressee is Athena; but he had already felt her presence as a father in Book 1 (ξεῖν', ἧ τοι μὲν ταῦτα φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύεις, / ὥς τε πατὴρ ᾧ παιδί: *Odyssey* 1.307-308); and while Thetis lives in the sea, Odysseus will come home from over the sea. Read through *Iliad* 1, therefore, Telemachus is here seeking help from two parents: the divine protectress who looks and feels like a father (who has already given him the courage even to get this far), and his actual father (whom he wants to come home).

⁷⁷ The last line of Book 24 repeats this line verbatim (Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν: *Odyssey* 24.548=2.268).

Second, Mentor is *hetairos* to Odysseus – as Mentēs was merely *xenos*. Both of these two meanings are distinctly post-Iliadic. With respect to the *men-* root: the Iliadic Athena is a straightforward war-goddess, guiding and strengthening spear-throws, the *men-* of the rage of war. But the Odyssean Athena gives courage to friends and terror to enemies, never directly altering the trajectory of a weapon, using the aegis as the ultimate psychological weapon – the *men-* of mind. With respect to the relationship: as Athena takes the form of the more intimate companion – the warrior-companion, not merely the guest-friend – she becomes more active, and ultimately decisive, in Odysseus’ return and victory. The first disguise determines the arena in which Athena will help the king; the second disguise decides how intimately Athena will associate with the royal family.

The change from Athena-*xenos* to Athena-*hetairos* signifies a change from Iliadic to Odyssean divine-human relations. In the *Iliad*, the relation between gods and humans is basically generalized-reciprocal, like *xenia*. Zeus helps Achilles because he owes Thetis a favor because of a favor she did him in the past; he feels badly for Hector because Hector consistently sacrifices correctly; the other Olympians choose sides for various retributive reasons.⁷⁸ In the *Odyssey*, Athena is at first a *xenos*, reciprocally related to Odysseus like an Iliadic god, but becomes *hetairos* quickly, as no Iliadic god ever does.⁷⁹ She owes Odysseus nothing by way of generalized reciprocity; she likes him because he is *polymetis*, like her mother. It is a happy

⁷⁸ For Iliadic vs. Odyssean gods see note 11 above.

⁷⁹ At *Iliad* 24.334-335 Zeus hints at *hetaireia* between Hermes and mortals (σοὶ γάρ τε μάλιστα γε φίλτατόν ἐστιν / ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι) in order to recommend that Hermes accompany Priam to Achilles’ tent. But this seems to describe Hermes’ special relationship with Priam in two ways determined by context rather than by the nature of divine-human relations. Insofar as Priam’s journey is a *katabasis*, Hermes is here serving in his normal role as *theopompos*. Insofar as Hermes serves a Priam’s charioteer, he is taking the human role often occupied in the *Iliad* by *hetairoi*. See Vernant 1963 for Hermes’ role as companion; for a recent treatment of Priam’s journey as *katabasis* see de Jáuregui 2011, with excellent bibliography (especially 37n1).

coincidence that the *nostos* of her favorite also vindicates the justice of her father's rule. The vengeful gods in the *Odyssey* are Poseidon and Helios;⁸⁰ but Poseidon fails to destroy Odysseus, and the objects of Helios' wrath brought destruction on themselves.

With respect to Athena's advancing relationship with Odysseus and his family, Athena's appearance as Mentor comes one step after her disguise as Mentos. But with respect to Mentor's appearances in the poem, Athena's approach "in the form of Mentor" (Μέντορι εἰδομένη) demonstrates a clear difference between mortal and divine *hetaireia*. When Mentor was merely *hetairos*, before Athena took on his appearance, he tried and failed to stir the Ithacan *demos* to drive out the suitors (*Odyssey* 2.229-241). But as the suitor Leocritus observes, in the setting of the *dais*, it is the suitors who can bring more men into the fight (245), and Leocritus' argument ends the assembly unrefuted. *Qua* human, Mentor-*hetairos* is defeated by the suitors' superior numbers. But forty lines later, *qua* goddess, Athena-Mentor-*hetairos* sets in motion a plan that will eventually lead to the slaughter of the suitors, in precisely the setting of the *dais*, by a much smaller force.

2.2.2 Reviving the hero's spirited body: Odysseus' secret *hetairos* in the *agon*

Nostos requires return to more than geographical location. The homecoming warrior must also return in spirit.⁸¹ As a rule, home is safer than combat; the warrior in combat-mode is unsuited to the *oikos*, even catastrophic; therefore *nostos* requires a wind-down, sometimes a physical cooling, a clear recognition of the boundary between battlefield and *oikos*.⁸² But

⁸⁰ On the question of whether Poseidon and Helios are 'primitive' or exceptional see note 121 below.

⁸¹ See Frame 1978 for the mythical link between *nostos* and *noos*.

⁸² For certain Indo-European myths and rituals as defenses against the frenzy of the returning warrior see Woodard 2013.

Odysseus' home is not safe. Local warriors are wooing his wife and stealing his fortune. The battlefield of the *Odyssey* is Odysseus' palace. He rebuilds the combat strength he needs to retake his home, but does not rekindle the combat fury that makes returning warriors catastrophic at home.

The rehabilitation of Odysseus must therefore heal him both psychologically and physically. For ten years his relationship with his warrior-companions grows toxic, until the *hetairoi* destroy themselves in the middle of a mutiny. For seven years on Ogygia his strength is useless, his body worth only the erotic satisfaction it gives Calypso. Neither healing will be easy; the trauma of both mind and body is considerable.

The episode on Phaeacia rehabilitates Odysseus in both mind and body, and yet allows him to retain the warrior prowess he needs to defeat the suitors in battle. Alcinous helps heal Odysseus' mind, allowing him to reclaim his identity by telling the story of his sorrows. In the *Odyssey*'s remarkably veristic treatment of combat psychology, recovery of the psyche takes considerable time.⁸³ Alcinous the therapist lets Odysseus talk for three books, telling his whole story from Troy to Phaeacia.⁸⁴

But first Odysseus must give a sign that he is capable of psychic recovery. The first such sign is also the first moment of his physical rehabilitation (*Odyssey* 8.193-221). In a single moment, at a single discus-throw, Odysseus regains his physical confidence and reclaims his superiority as a warrior.

⁸³ The most complete treatment remains Shay 2002.

⁸⁴ For Alcinous' skill and efficacy as a therapist see Race 2014, refuting Rose 1969. Alcinous' name may hint at this aspect of his role in the *Odyssey*.

At this moment Odysseus feels Athena as his *hetairos*:

...ἔθηκε δὲ τέρματ' Ἀθήνη

ἀνδρὶ δέμας εἰκυῖα, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·

“καὶ κ' ἀλαός τοι, ξεῖνε, διακρίνειε τὸ σῆμα

ἀμφοφύων, ἐπεὶ οὗ τι μεμιγμένον ἐστὶν ὁμίλῳ,

ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρῶτον. σὺ δὲ θάρσει τόνδε γ' ἄεθλον·

οὗ τις Φαιήκων τόν γ' ἵξεται οὐδ' ὑπερήσει.”

ὥς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,

χαίρων οὔνεχ' **ἐταῖρον** ἐνῆεα λεῦσσε' ἐν ἁγῶνι.

(*Odyssey* 8.193-200)⁸⁵

The moment is the beginning of the rehabilitation of Odysseus the warrior. Two young Phaeacians have just provoked him, and he has just responded by hurling a discus farther than any Phaeacian.⁸⁶ Athena, disguised as an unnamed human, confirms that nobody will beat his throw. The most striking thing about this passage is that Athena is called *hetairos* precisely when Odysseus rejoices in her support, even though he cannot possibly have seen this *hetairos* before. The word must therefore be focalized: an anonymous man qualifies as *hetairos* in Odysseus' eyes simply because (οὔνεχ') he feels his support. More specifically, Odysseus receives

⁸⁵ Scholion B explains that Athena often appears as one of Odysseus' *philoï* because she often responds to his request for help (ὅστις ἦν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ὁμοιωθεῖσά τινα τῶν φίλων Ὀδυσσεύος, ὡς πολλάκις φαίνεται ἤκουσα εἰς βοήθειαν).

⁸⁶ For Euryalos' folk-tale role as rival suitor and provocateur at a wedding feast see Paton 1912 and Woodhouse 1930, 54-58, cited in Tebben 2008, 35.

confidence and joy from seeing the *hetairos* in the *agon*. The *agon* is felt as more than the immediate competition with Phaeacian youth. For Odysseus, this *agon* is the first time he has shown his physical prowess, won any competition, or proved himself best⁸⁷ in any way since the end of the Trojan war.⁸⁸

Moreover, while the tale to Alcinous in Books 9-12 allows Odysseus to reclaim his identity, this victory in the discus-throw is the only time he is rehabilitated in his body.⁸⁹ This one success is apparently sufficient to give Odysseus confidence in all his powers as a warrior. His speech in the following lines challenges any Phaeacian in any athletic competition (*Odyssey* 8.202-212) except the footrace (231-233), catalogues his various military skills (212-220) with special emphasis on his skill at the bow (218-220), recalls Iliadic *hetaireia* explicitly (216-217), and boasts that he is the best at various martial and athletic pursuits (221).⁹⁰ The confidence Odysseus gains from the throw, magnified by the words of Athena *qua hetairos*, lasts until the end of the poem. From the moment Athena appears to him as *hetairos*, Odysseus wins everything he attempts.

This peculiar combination of private confidence with the intimacy of divine *hetaireia* is not intelligible in Iliadic terms, in two ways. First: while individual Iliadic heroes can receive

⁸⁷ For Odysseus, being among the best is also a sign of youth: ἐγὼ δ' οὐ νῆϊς ἀέθλων, / ὥς σύ γε μυθεῖται, ἀλλ' ἐν πρώτοισιν ὄϊω / ἔμμεναι, ὄφρ' ἥβη τε πεποίθεα χερσὶ τ' ἐμῇσι (*Odyssey* 8.179-181).

⁸⁸ For the progression of Odysseus' boasts as sign of his heroic revival see Nagler 1990, 349n42.

⁸⁹ For Odysseus' sufferings as establishing his identity (and consequently the *Apologoi* as answer to Alcinous' question at *Odyssey* 8.550: εἴπ' ὄνομ') see especially Dimock 1956.

⁹⁰ The phrase τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἐμέ φημι πολὺ προφερέστερον εἶναι recalls his claim to preeminence as a youth (*Odyssey* 8.179-181) but extends the boast into the present. Before the throw he was a has-been; now he is at the peak of his powers. For the significance of Odysseus' self-assessment as the best Achaean archer at Troy except for Philoctetes, but not comparable to Heracles and Eurytus, in the context of the archery contest in Book 21, see Clay 1984, 91-93.

courage and grow confident in their private connection with a god, the courage and confidence they receive from *hetairoi* is always public and well-known. Private strength from the gods is felt as power, not companionship; but here Odysseus feels companionship with his divine supporter simply by virtue of her encouraging words.⁹¹ Second: in the *Iliad*, confidence won by success in athletic competition does not transfer into combat. The two types of *agon* are not felt to be as close as Odysseus feels them here. The winners of the games in *Iliad* 23 are all skilled heroes, but not necessarily the best warriors in combat. After his discus-throw, however, Odysseus boasts of his physical prowess in both types of *agon*—first games, then deadly combat. The uniquely Odyssean bond between the hero and the goddess-*hetairos* brings these two features of post-Iliadic *hetaireia* together.

2.2.3 Trust before battle: divine Athena rather than mortal *hetairoi*

In Book 8 Athena gives Odysseus confidence in his physical strength. He does not know that she is the *hetairos* whose encouragement gives him joy; he feels only that he can again trust in the strength of his own body. But in Book 13, in the first two-way conversation between the goddess and her favorite, Athena critiques Odysseus for failing to recognize that she has been with him all along, particularly among the Phaeacians (*Odyssey* 13.299-302).⁹² Athena deserves trust for helping him, although she does not specifically mention that she was the unknown *hetairos* who praised his discus-throw.

⁹¹ Odysseus perhaps recognizes her encouragement after the fact, as he says at *Odyssey* 13.323-323 (πρὶν γ' ὅτε Φαίηκων ἀνδρῶν ἐν πίονι δήμῳ / θάρσυνάς τ' ἐπέεσσι καὶ ἐς πόλιν ἤγαγεσ' αὐτή). Nothing in Book 8 indicates that he recognizes her at the time.

⁹² At *Odyssey* 7.28 Athena-Phaeacian-girl merely responds to Odysseus' request for directions. At *Odyssey* 8.195, Athena-Phaeacian-*hetairos* encourages Odysseus and Odysseus says nothing in return.

In Book 20 Athena explicitly sets the trust she expects from Odysseus against the trust he gives mortal *hetairoi*. On the eve of the archery contest, the suitors carouse loudly with the female slaves, and Odysseus cannot sleep. He tries to talk himself into confidence by recalling his *metis* in the Cyclopes' cave, but his heart is not persuaded enough to keep him from tossing and turning like a stomach-sausage roasting on the fire. The cause of his fear is simple: he is one among many:

ὥς ἄρ' ὃ γ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσεται μερμηρίζων,

ὅπως δὴ μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφήσει,

μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσι⁹³...

(*Odyssey* 20.28-30).

Of course Odysseus is not alone, as he will receive the physical support of three other mortals. But the suitors' superior numbers make a group of four ineffective. Mentor's principle of strength in numbers (*Odyssey* 2.241) is obviously true, and as a result human supporters cannot give Odysseus sufficient courage. Despite the allied swords of his son and slaves, Odysseus feels alone. But the instant Odysseus' mind articulates this tactical principle, Athena comes to him from heaven:

...σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη

οὐρανόθεν καταβᾶσα...

⁹³ Cf. *Odyssey* 12.297, where Odysseus accuses Eurylochos (with the *hetairoi* he has persuaded to land at Thrinakia) of overpowering him insofar as he is only one man (Εὐρύλοχ', ἣ μάλα δὴ με βιάζεστε μοῦνον ἔοντα). Contrast *Iliad* 15.610-612, where Hector, "alone among many," feels no fear: αὐτὸς γάρ οἱ ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἦεν ἀμύντωρ — Ζεὺς, ὃς μιν πλεόνεσσι μετ' ἀνδράσι μοῦνον ἔοντα — τίμα καὶ κύδαινε...

(*Odyssey* 20.30-31)

The words οὐρανόθεν καταβᾶσα emphasize Athena's divinity. Her argument against Odysseus' fear depends on her divinity. Mentor's principle is true for mortals, as Odysseus knows; but then a goddess comes from the sky and reminds him of his trump-card: his special bond with Athena herself. He ought to trust her more than any *hetairos* who might die:

σχέτλιε, καὶ μὲν τίς τε **χερείονι** πείθεθ' **ἑταίρω**,

ὅς περ θνητός τ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ **τόσα** μήδεα οἶδεν·

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, διαμπερὲς ἢ σε φυλάσσω

ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισ' ...

(*Odyssey* 20.45-48)

Athena's argument is *a fortiori*. Odysseus is a fool for not trusting Athena when any human (τις) would trust an inferior *hetairos*—an ignorant mortal, while Athena knows everything because she is a god.⁹⁴ She does not actually call herself *hetairos* in this passage because her argument presupposes that a similar bond obtains between Odysseus and a mortal *hetairos*, on the one hand, and Odysseus and Athena, on the other. Both mortal and immortal wish to help Odysseus; but the decisive difference between the two is a matter of nature. One will die, and yet anyone would trust him; the other will not die, and knows everything, and therefore anyone ought to trust her far more. The comparative adjective is a matter of better or worse: the difference between the two is encoded in *χερείονι*, not *ἑταίρω*.

⁹⁴ For divine criticism of mortals for inferior knowledge see Murnaghan 1987, 51 (citing Richardson 1974, 243-244).

Athena's choice of verb (πείθεθ') sets the new, Odyssean source of support for a hero against the support offered by mortal *hetaireia*. In the *Iliad*, not only is *peith-* associated with *hetairoi*, but also *pist-* is associated with specifically mortal *hetairoi*, insofar as the *pistos hetairos* characteristically dies in the passage in which he is named *pistos*.⁹⁵ Here in Athena's claim to supersede mortal *hetaireia*, the *hetairos* is untrustworthy because he is mortal and ignorant; while Athena is trustworthy because she is immortal and omniscient.

Athena's contrast implies something else about post-Iliadic warfare. The features of *hetaireia* that make *hetairoi* so essential to a warrior's success in the *Iliad* are irrelevant next to the features of Athena's relationship with Odysseus.⁹⁶ The feature of *hetairoi* that determines the motivational and affective significance of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad*—the fact that *hetairoi* might die—is removed when the *hetairos* is from heaven. In the *Iliad*, trust and mortality go together, so *pistos* and *hetairos* go together even when the *hetairos* is going to die. In the *Odyssey*, Athena decouples trust and mortality and sets them against one another. Mortality makes the *hetairos* ignorant and therefore untrustworthy. Immortality makes the *hetairos* knowledgeable and thus worthy of Odysseus' implicit trust.

The link between immortality and Athena's superior *hetaireia* is manifest in the changing semantics of *heta(i)r-* in the *Odyssey*. From its first appearance in the proem, the *Odyssey* primes the audience to feel '*hetairos*' as miserable, pitiable, foolish, burdensome, untrustworthy, destructive, catastrophic—the status of *hetaireia* at the end of Book 12. Odysseus knows all too

⁹⁵ See Chapter 1, under "The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*."

⁹⁶ The mortality of the *hetairoi* is additionally activated by the psychological context. Just before Athena delivers this speech, Odysseus tries to encourage himself by comparing the present situation favorably with the destruction of his *hetairoi* in the cave of the Cyclopes (*Odyssey* 20.18-21). The argument works on his ἦτορ and κραδίη (22-23) but "he himself tossed this way and that" (ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἐλίσσετο ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα: 24, noting the double contrastive ἀτὰρ plus αὐτός). Odysseus' αὐτός is more precisely what needs Athena's moral support.

well that, as Athena says, mortal *hetairoi* do not deserve trust. The significance of ‘Athena,’ unfolded progressively in narrative time from her first intervention in Book 1 to her final appearance as Mentor in Book 24, is just the opposite. ‘Athena’ is felt as protective, courageous, reliable, affectionate, trustworthy, powerful. What Athena means in the *Odyssey*, ‘*hetairos*’ means in the *Iliad*—except that, in the *Iliad*, ‘*hetairos*’ also means vulnerability and grief. The discrepancy has an obvious metaphysical explanation: Athena is immortal. The difference between the Athena-Odysseus *hetaireia* and the Achilles-Patroclus *hetaireia* also has profound literary effect: the *Odyssey* has a happy ending.⁹⁷

The trust owed Athena-*hetairos* is greater than the trust earned by mortal *hetairoi*, and the effects of Athena’s *hetaireia* are different in kind. Normal tactical considerations disappear when the hero’s *hetairos* is immortal. When Odysseus is worried that the suitors are too many for him, Athena insists that no number of warriors can match the strength she will give Odysseus:

εἴ περ πεντήκοντα λόχοι μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

νῶϊ περιστᾷεν, κτεῖναι μεμαῶτες Ἄρηϊ,

καὶ κεν τῶν ἐλάσαιο βόας καὶ ἵφια μῆλα.

(*Odyssey* 20.49-51).

Athena’s principle runs directly counter to Mentor’s. Her *hetaireia* does not obey the laws of military companionship among mortals. Heroes will trust mortal *hetairoi*, even when the odds are against them; but odds mean nothing when a god is on the same side.

⁹⁷ Hölscher 1967 presents the *Odyssey* as the first epic with a “happy ending” (glücklicher Ausgang).

For Athena, as for Iliadic *hetairoi*, trust goes both ways. She expects Odysseus to trust her; she also trusts Odysseus. In Book 20 she sets Odysseus' (well-founded) trust in her against his (ill-founded) trust in mortal *hetairoi*. In Book 13 she sets what makes her trust Odysseus against what ties him to mortal *hetairoi*. On the Ithacan shore, during their first two-way encounter, and in one sentence, Athena names the features of Odysseus that most endear him to her and asserts that she always trusted that he could return even without *hetairoi*:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτ' ἀπίστεον, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ θυμῳ

ἦδε', ὃ νοστήσεις ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους...

(*Odyssey* 13.339-340)

She trusts him (*pist-*) to return home after losing his *hetairoi*. Athena's picture of the relation between the *nostos* of Odysseus and the *nostos* of his *hetairoi* contrasts strongly with the picture painted at *Odyssey* 1.5, where Odysseus desired *nostos* for his *hetairoi* (ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων) but could not achieve it. Then he cared about his *hetairoi*; now Athena, at least, does not.⁹⁸ Moreover, the subject and object of trust have shifted as *hetaireia* has progressed: whereas in the *Iliad* *hetairoi* are characteristically objects of the *peith/pist* taking hero as subject, here in *Odyssey* 13 Odysseus is the object of *peith/pist* (οὐ ποτ' ἀπίστεον) where Athena is the subject, precisely insofar as she considers Odysseus successful without *hetairoi*.

Athena's trust in Odysseus is well placed. Not only does he actually return home, unlike his *hetairoi*, just as she expected, but also the Homeric narrative honors him like a god. On

⁹⁸ She repeats the refrain first spoken by Halitherses at *Odyssey* 2.174 (ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους), repeated often as a dirge for Odysseus' lost *hetairoi*. But this time the loss of the *hetairoi* is not suffering but rather a foil whereby the home-come Odysseus, contrasted with his dead *hetairoi*, deserves Athena's special trust.

Ithaca, where he speaks with Athena openly, Odysseus is a mortal speaking on friendly terms with a goddess. She relates to him as *hetairos*; she appears to his son as Mentor *patrios hetairos*. On Ithaca Odysseus does two things that typically only immortals do. First, on a thematic level: he returns to test his household as if a *theoxenos*, a divine enforcer of justice and proof that mortals reap what they sow. Second, on the level of narrative detail: not himself immortal, he returns to Ithaca on the road reserved for the immortals:

ἐν δ' ὕδατ' ἀενάοντα. δύω δέ τέ οἱ θύραι εἰσίν,
αἱ μὲν πρὸς βορέαο καταιβαταὶ ἀνθρώποισιν,
αἱ δ' αὖ πρὸς νότου εἰσὶ θεώτεραι· οὐδέ τι κείνη
ἄνδρες ἐσέρχονται, **ἀλλ' ἀθανάτων ὁδὸς ἐστίν.**

(*Odyssey* 13.109-113)

This passage has been interpreted fruitfully in many ways, most obviously as a case of *theoxenia*.⁹⁹ But the difference between the Book 1 proem and the Book 13 second proem already hints at something human and divine: in Book 13, *andra* is qualified by θεοῖς' ἐναλίγκια, which has no parallel in Book 1. In Book 1, Odysseus was among *hetairoi* and lost them; in Book 13, Odysseus is without *hetairoi* and returns like a god.

The ship itself signifies Odysseus post-*hetairoi*. Phaeacian ships know the thoughts and minds of humans, and therefore need no steersman or steering-oar.¹⁰⁰ But Odysseus' previous

⁹⁹ For the spring and cave of the nymphs as marker of sacred boundary see Edwards 1993, 38-39 (drawing on Scully 1990, 13-14 for the general significance of springs in Homer).

¹⁰⁰ *Odyssey* 8.557-559: οὐ γὰρ Φαιήκεσσι κυβερνητῆρες ἔασιν / οὐδέ τι πηδάλι' ἐστί, τά τ' ἄλλαι νῆες ἔχουσιν· / ἀλλ' αὐταὶ ἴσασι νοήματα καὶ φρένας ἀνδρῶν.

approach to the Ithacan shore was spoiled by the opening of the bag of the winds—an error performed by Odysseus’ *hetairoi* but caused partly by Odysseus’ untrustworthy leadership and occasioned immediately by Odysseus’ inability to stay awake at the helm, in the steering position that he could not entrust to any of the *hetairoi*.¹⁰¹ Where human *hetairoi* ruin *nostos* while Odysseus sleeps (and therefore cannot control them), the magical Phaeacian ship achieves *nostos* while Odysseus sleeps (and does not need to control them).

2.2.4 Psychological warfare: Athena’s new role in battle and the autonomy of morale

The Odyssean Athena resembles Iliadic *hetairoi* insofar as she gives and earns trust in matters of life and death. She is unlike Iliadic *hetairoi* insofar as she is never directly described as providing physical assistance in battle. In this respect she is also strikingly unlike the Iliadic Athena and again unlike Odysseus’ mortal supporters on Ithaca. The physical support of son and slaves is not enough to give Odysseus courage the night before the battle. Athena blames him for trusting her too little and gives him the courage he needs to fight. The *Odyssey* poet is careful to keep the two aspects of military support—the moral and the physical—apart: the former in Athena, the latter in family and slaves. Mortal *hetaireia* having dissolved on the journey from Troy, the mental side of *hetaireia* must come from someone with immeasurably superior mind—necessarily, in Athena’s words, an immortal. The form in which the war-goddess makes war is Mentor-*hetairos*, and her mode of war-making is a matter of morale.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ *Odyssey* 10.32-33: αἰεὶ γὰρ πόδα νηὸς ἐνώμων, οὐδέ τι ἄλλω / δῶχ’ ἐτάρων, ἵνα θᾶσσον ἰκοίμεθα πατρίδα γαῖαν.

¹⁰² There is no scholarly consensus on how Athena became a war-goddess; see Nilsson 1921, 16 (Myceneans adopted a Minoan palace goddess); Frame 2009, §3.41-42.

The Odyssean Athena's new, psychological role in battle is emphasized every time she appears in combat. In the *Odyssey*, Athena intervenes in battle six times. In four cases, she gives courage to the royal family in the form of Mentor *hetairos*. In two cases, she takes courage away from the suitors and their families in magical form.

Athena's first military intervention comes just after Eumaius thwarts Melanthius' mission to find the suitors' armor. The four mortal fighters have just been re-united when the goddess appears:

τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἀγχίμολον θυγάτηρ Διὸς ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη

Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν.

(*Odyssey* 22.205-206)

This introduction is nearly identical to her first appearance as Mentor (*Odyssey* 22.20=2.268). As she appeared to the son to send him to find his father, so she appears to the father to help him defeat his enemies in battle. Odysseus rejoices to see her and appeals to *hetaireia* explicitly:

“Μέντορ, ἄμυνον ἀρήν, **μνησai δ' ἐτάριοι φίλοιοι**,

ὅς σ' ἀγαθὰ ῥέζεσκον· ὀμηλική δέ μοί ἐστι.”

(*Odyssey* 22.208-209)

In Book 2, Athena-Mentor was Odysseus' *hetairos*; in Book 22, Odysseus is the *hetairos* of Athena-Mentor. But Odysseus' words attach *hetaireia* to Athena, not Mentor, as the poet immediately explains:

ὥς φάτ', **οὔόμενος λαοσσόον ἔμμεν' Ἀθήνην**.

(*Odyssey* 22.210)

Odysseus calls himself *hetairos* of the rouser (λαοσσόον) whom he believes is Athena. His reaction to the unexpected support of Athena *hetairos* parallels his reaction to Athena *hetairos* on Scheria—discovery followed by rejoicing, even though on Scheria Odysseus does not recognize that the *hetairos* is Athena:

τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς γήθησεν ἰδὼν καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε·

(*Odyssey* 22.207)

ὣς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,

χαίρων οὔνεχ' ἑταῖρον ἐνὲά λεῦσσε' ἐν ἀγῶνι

(*Odyssey* 8.199-200)

The physical rehabilitation begun with a discus-throw and magnified by encouragement from the *hetairos* in the *agon* is now almost complete. What began with the appearance of one *hetairos* ends with the appearance of another. The bringer of victory is Athena *hetairos*, in two forms.

The suitors' reaction confirms the solidarity between Odysseus and Athena. They threaten the goddess that they still think is Mentor (*Odyssey* 22.213-223), and their ignorance of the goddess highlights Odysseus' knowledge. The goddess responds by rebuking Odysseus for his weakness and telling him to stand near her so that he may understand her true nature:

ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο, πέπον, παρ' ἔμ' ἵστασο καὶ ἴδε ἔργον,

ὄφρ' εἰδῇς, οἷός τοι ἐν ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι

Μέντωρ Ἀλκμίδης εὐεργεσίας ἀποτίνειν.

(*Odyssey* 22.233-235)

She cannot mean that Odysseus should understand the sort of human Mentor is, since Odysseus already knows that she is Athena. As if anyone still thought that Mentor himself were present, she immediately turns into a swallow (239-240). The magical change emphasizes that the apparent Mentor is not really Mentor—that the true nature of ‘Mentor’ is something divine.

Although Athena-Mentor gives Odysseus courage and joy, she will not fight beside him like an Iliadic god. When Odysseus explicitly asks her to do so, the *Odyssey* poet says that she did not:

ἀλλ’ ἄγε δεῦρο, πέπον, παρ’ ἔμ’ ἵστασο καὶ ἴδε ἔργον,

ὄφρ’ εἰδῆς, οἷός τοι ἐν ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι

Μέντωρ Ἀλκιμίδης εὐεργεσίας ἀποτίνειν.

ἦ ῥα, καὶ οὐ πω πάγχυ δίδου ἑτεραλκέα νίκην,

ἀλλ’ ἔτ’ ἄρα σθένεός τε καὶ ἀλκῆς πειρήτιζεν

ἡμὲν Ὀδυσσεύος ἡδ’ υἱοῦ κυδαλίμοιο.

αὐτὴ δ’ αἰθαλόεντος ἀνὰ μεγάροιο μέλαθρον

ἔζετ’ ἀναΐζασα, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη ἄντην.

(*Odyssey* 22.236-240)

The phrases καὶ οὐ πω and ἀλλ’ ἔτ’ ἄρα contrast what happens with the expectation that Athena will help Odysseus fight directly (as she does to her favorites in the *Iliad*). Where the *Iliad* would normally narrate a physical deflection in detail, and where the logic of the narrative implies that

Athena must have affected the suitors' spear-throws directly, the *Odyssey* poet avoids emphasizing the material aspect of her intervention, saying only that Athena “made [the suitors' throws] ineffective”:¹⁰³

τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐτώσια¹⁰⁴ θῆκεν Ἀθήνη

(*Odyssey* 22.256=22.273)

Later she deploys the aegis simply to take away the suitors' mental capacity (φρένες):

δὴ τότε Ἀθηναίη φθισίμβροτον αἰγίδ' ἀνέσχευ

ὕψοθεν ἐξ ὀροφῆς· τῶν δὲ φρένες ἐπτοίγηεν.

¹⁰³ Even though the narrative would not make sense without Athena's physical intervention, Homer avoids narrating the material aspect of the event. After her direct involvement at *Odyssey* 22.256 and 273, the spears miss, but Athena is not described as the one who dashes them in a specific direction. Rather, the weapons themselves are the subjects of verbs of striking and falling (22.257-259=275-278: τῶν ἄλλος μὲν σταθμὸν ἐϋσταθέος μεγάροιο / βεβλήκειν, ἄλλος δὲ θύρην πυκινῶς ἀραρυῖαν· / ἄλλου δ' ἐν τοίχῳ μελίη πέσε χαλκοβάρεια). Contrast the vivid, concrete narration of the Athena's combat interventions the *Iliad*, where the poet of the *Iliad* makes her the grammatical agent of spatially and corporeally specific actions. She guides Diomedes' spear straight at Sthenelus' nose, next to his eyes (*Iliad* 5.290: βέλος δ' ἴθυνεν Ἀθήνη / ῥῖνα παρ' ὀφθαλμόν, λευκοὺς δ' ἐπέρησεν ὀδόντας); she seizes Diomedes' reins and whip to turn the chariot against Ares (5.840: λάξετο δὲ μάστιγα καὶ ἡνία Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη); she thrusts Ares' spear-throw above Diomedes' chariot (5.853-854: καὶ τό γε χειρὶ λαβοῦσα θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη / ὥσεν ὑπὲκ δίφροιο ἐτώσιον αἰχθῆναι) and drives Diomedes' spear into Ares' belt (856-857) ἐπέρεισε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / νεῖατον ἐς κενεῶνα ὄθι ζωννύσκετο μίτρη); she blows Hector's spear back from Achilles with a soft breath (20.438-440: καὶ τό γ' Ἀθήνη / πνοιῇ Ἀχιλλῆος πάλιν ἔτραπε κυδαλίμοιο / ἦκα μάλα ψύξασα); she lifts a rock in her powerful hand and smashes Ares in the neck (21.403, 406: ἦ δ' ἀναχασσαμένη λίθον εἵλετο χειρὶ παχείῃ... τῷ βάλε θοῦρον Ἄρηα κατ' αὐχένα, λῦσε δὲ γυῖα); she snatches up the spear Achilles cast unsuccessfully against Hector and returns it to him (22.276-277: ἀνὰ δ' ἤρπασε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, / ἄψ δ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ δίδου).

¹⁰⁴ ἐτώσιος is rare in Homer (*Iliad* 17.633; 3.368; 5.854; 14.407; 18.104; 22.292; *Odyssey* 22.256, 273; 24.283) and often emphasizes the helplessness of mortals, e.g.: Menelaus praying to Zeus, describing the effect of Aphrodite's miraculous rescue of Paris on his spear-throw (ἤϊχθη παλάμῃφιν ἐτώσιον, οὐδ' ἔβαλόν μιν: *Iliad* 3.368); Athena deflecting Ares' spear-throw in a specific physical direction (ὥσεν ὑπὲκ δίφροιο ἐτώσιον αἰχθῆναι: 5.854). Hector's spear-throw failing to penetrate the inner layers of Ajax's shield (ὅττι ρά οἱ βέλος ὠκὺ ἐτώσιον ἔκφυγε χειρός: 14.407); Ajax observing that everything happens as Zeus dispenses, making mortal efforts useless (ἡμῖν δ' αὐτῶς πᾶσιν ἐτώσια πίπτει ἔραζε: 17.633); Achilles accusing himself of sitting on the shore useless while Patroclus dies (ἀλλ' ἦμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης: 18.104); Hector groaning when his spear-throw misses Achilles (ὅττι ρά οἱ βέλος ὠκὺ ἐτώσιον ἔκφυγε χειρός: *Iliad* 22.292). The two examples in *Odyssey* 22 are discussed in the previous note. In *Odyssey* 24.283: Laertes tells disguised Odysseus that the gifts he supposedly gave Odysseus were fruitless (δῶρα δ' ἐτώσια ταῦτα χαρίζεο, μυρὶ' ὀπάζων).

οἱ δ' ἐφέβοντο κατὰ μέγαρον βόες ὥς ἀγελαῖαι·

(*Odyssey* 22.297-299)

The aegis causes a psychological breakdown, a retreat described in a simile that turns the suitors into stampeding prey vulnerable to the predatory Ithacan royals (*Odyssey* 22.302-209).¹⁰⁵ Athena thus ends the battle by shattering the suitors' morale, just as she initiates Odysseus' return to heroic strength by building his morale on Phaeacia in Book 8.

With the suitors defeated, the suitors' families plot revenge. Again Athena-Mentor appears to help the royal family, and again the bond of *hetaireia* is made explicit. The battle begins as Athena comes in Mentor's form for a third time, again after the mortal fighters are assembled, again in the same words:

τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἀγχίμολον θυγάτηρ Διὸς ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη,

Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν.

τὴν μὲν ἰδὼν γήθησε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,

αἶψα δὲ Τηλέμαχον προσεφώνεεν ὄν φίλον υἱόν·

(*Odyssey* 24.502-505)

As at *Odyssey* 8.199-200 and 22.207, Odysseus sees Athena *hetairos* and rejoices. This time he passes the joy to his son and exhorts him to honor his family by winning in battle (506-509).

Telemachus responds with both obedience and maturity (510-511), and Laertes in turn rejoices to

¹⁰⁵ The Iliadic aegis also causes psychological breakdown, consequent on its nature (ἦν περὶ μὲν πάντη Φόβος ἐστεφάνωνται, / ἐν δ' Ἔρις, ἐν δ' Ἀλκή, ἐν δὲ κρυόεσσα Ἰώκη, / ἐν δέ τε Γοργεῖη κεφαλῇ: *Iliad* 5.739-741). The aegis has the same basically psychological powers in the two epics, but in the *Iliad* the use of the aegis is typically coupled with concrete physical intervention by the gods, as does not happen in the *Odyssey*.

see father and son contend with one another for ἀρετή (514-515). Athena-Mentor-*hetairos* has brought the family together in battle, uniting them in both bellicosity and joy.

The closing sequence of the *Odyssey* paints a vivid picture of Athena in all aspects of the *hetaireia* between her and the Ithacan royal household. The last appearance of the word *hetairos* in Homer comes in Athena's speech to Laertes as she gives him internal strength in a passage discussed above (*Odyssey* 24.516-520). After intervening to strengthen Laertes' throw, Athena routs the king's last enemies with one final blast of her terrifying voice (531-535). The conclusion of the last Homeric battle is the effect of a psychological attack, initiated by a god who in the same breath presents herself to the royal family as their *hetairos*.¹⁰⁶ The victory is so complete that Zeus must throw a restraining lightning-bolt and Athena must restrain Odysseus and Telemachus to prevent them from killing every single enemy.¹⁰⁷ The final words of the poem bring all aspects of Athena's new, divine *hetaireia* together:

ὥς φάτ' Ἀθηναίη, ὃ δ' ἐπείθετο, χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ.

ὄρκια δ' αὖ κατόπισθε μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔθηκε

Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,

Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἡδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν.

¹⁰⁶ She takes away the suitors' wits in a rather more mysterious and horrifying moment at *Odyssey* 20.345-349: μνηστῆρσι δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / ἄσβεστον γέλω ὥρσε, παρέπλαγξεν δὲ νόημα. / οἱ δ' ἤδη γναθμοῖσι γελῶων ἄλλοτρίοισιν, / αἰμοφόρυκτα δὲ δὴ κρέα ἤσθιον· ὅσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων / δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, γόνον δ' ὤϊετο θυμός.

¹⁰⁷ They would have killed everyone if Athena did not tell them to stop (καὶ νύ κε δὴ πάντας ὄλεσαν καὶ θῆκαν ἀνόστους, εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίη... ἴσχεσθε πτολέμου, Ἰθακήσιοι: *Odyssey* 24.528-531). But Odysseus attacks like a predator anyway (διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς, οἶμῃσεν δὲ ἀλείς ὥς τ' αἰετὸς ὑψιπετείης: 538). Then Zeus himself intervenes (καὶ τότε δὴ Κρονίδης ἀφίει ψολόεντα κεραυνόν: 539), but even so Odysseus stops only when he 'obeys'/'peith'- Athena and rejoices (δὴ τότε Ὀδυσσεῖα προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη... "διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ, ἴσχεο, παῦε δὲ νεῖκος ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο, μὴ πῶς τοι Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς." ὥς φάτ' Ἀθηναίη, ὃ δ' ἐπείθετο, χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ: 541-545).

(*Odyssey* 24.545-548)

Odysseus trusts her (ἐπαίθετο), as she told him she deserves more than any mortal *hetairos* (παίθεθ' ἑταίρω: *Odyssey* 20.45) and as mortal *hetairoi* implicitly trust one another in the *Iliad*. He rejoices in his heart (χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ) on Ithaca as on Scheria (8.200, 22.207, 24.545). The feelings between the two are the feelings of Iliadic *hetaireia*, but human *hetairoi* have been replaced and improved by the supremely powerful daughter of Zeus.

The last line of the *Odyssey* is the fourth verbatim repetition of Athena's appearance as Odysseus' *patrios hetairos* (24.548=24.503=22.206=2.268=2.401).¹⁰⁸

2.2.5 Cosmic justice and Odysseus' *nostos*: Athena-*hetairos*' twofold mission¹⁰⁹

The *Odyssey* opens with two problems. First, Odysseus is not home. Second, the cosmos appears unjust. From a human perspective, the lack of *nostos* is the central problem, and the *Odyssey* is about how Odysseus comes home. From an Olympian perspective, however, cosmic injustice is the greater problem, and Athena causes Odysseus' return only after a disagreement between father-god and daughter-god over the link between mortal choices and mortal suffering. For the gods, the *Odyssey* is about how the cosmos, unjust so long as Odysseus is on Ogygia, becomes just when he returns to Ithaca and is restored to house and throne, and about how Athena and Zeus come to agree about *dike* only when Odysseus returns home.

¹⁰⁸ Clay 1974 offers evidence from etymology, scholia, and the larger commentary tradition for the precise meaning of this phrase (which has no exact Iliadic parallel). *Demas* signifies not simply surface or appearance, but specifically the surface as encasement representing the whole individual, and *aude* refers specifically to the sound of intelligible human (and not divine) speech.

¹⁰⁹ For the *Odyssey* as Athena's project see especially Murnaghan 1995. Cf. Kullmann 1985, 6: "The interventions of Athena mainly, though not exclusively, serve the purpose to assert the moral principles of the rule of Zeus."

The proem describes Odysseus' wanderings and sufferings, and the climax of the list of sufferings is the loss of his *hetairoi*. Odysseus wants two things: his life and homecoming and the homecoming of his *hetairoi* (ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων). He keeps his life and gets his homecoming; his *hetairoi* destroy themselves and ruin their own homecoming by their own folly (σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο) when they eat the cattle of the sun. The god himself takes away their day of homecoming (αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ), a fate the *hetairoi* have earned for themselves.¹¹⁰ As the poem opens, the cause of the central injustice is the *atasthalia* of Odysseus' *hetairoi*. The theme word promises a contrast between Odysseus and his *hetairoi*. If the *Odyssey* is partly about one man who returned and partly about the many *hetairoi* who did not, then the initial appearance of the word '*andra*' makes it quite clear that the one man is more important to the *Odyssey* poet than his many *hetairoi*.

Zeus famously moralizes the link between divine vengeance and human folly.¹¹¹ The sufferings of mortals are a matter, not of cosmic injustice, but on the contrary, a necessary consequence and clear demonstration that cosmic justice is universal:

ὦ πόποι, οἶον δὴ νῦν θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται.

ἐξ ἡμέων γὰρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ

σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσιν...

¹¹⁰ For the centrality of saving the *hetairoi* to the mythical context of Odysseus' *nostos* (a word that specifically signifies both 'surviving lethal dangers' and 'bringing others safe from danger') see Bonifazi 2009, 494-495, with Frame 1978, 9-19.

¹¹¹ That Zeus' speech is self-consciously programmatic: Jaeger 1926; Dodds 1951, 32; Whitman 1958, 305; Rüter 1969, 64-82; Lloyd-Jones 1971; Kullmann 1985, 5-7; Friedrich 1987, 375-376; Winterbottom 1989, 37-40; Segal 1992; Marks 2008, chapter 1; Graziosi and Haubold 2005, 76; Allan 2006, 17-18.

(*Odyssey* 1.32-34)

Zeus uses the same words to describe universal mortal self-destruction as the proem uses to describe the *hetairoi*'s self-destruction.¹¹² In the proem, the *hetairoi* destroyed themselves by their own folly (σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν).¹¹³ In Zeus' theodicy, mortals bring excessive sorrows on themselves by their own folly (σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν).¹¹⁴ Thus the first instance in the poem of Zeus' theodicy is the self-destruction of Odysseus' *hetairoi*. Concomitantly, Odysseus' *hetairoi* represent humans most at odds with divine justice—both Helios' in the proem and, by verbal association, Zeus' in his theodicy.¹¹⁵

In response to Zeus' universal claim, Athena distinguishes Odysseus strongly from all self-destructive mortals by pointing out that Odysseus' present sorrows are not his fault.¹¹⁶ As

¹¹² Structural parallels between the proem and Zeus' speech also suggest a strong thematic link specifically with respect to *atasthalia*: see Cook 1995, 16-30. For Zeus' speech as the beginning of the plot of the *Odyssey* proper, satisfied only at the end of *Odyssey* 24, see Olson 1995, 24.

¹¹³ For this much-discussed word see Jaeger 1939, 143 (distinguishing *atasthalia* from *ate* as internal to external; the distinction is supported by Chantraine's etymology); Greene 1944, 22 ("a deliberate choice of evil," although 'evil' is too strong); Nagy 1979, 162-163; Nagler 1990; Cook 1999, 149n1 (noting that gods often commit *atasthalia* without moral weight and thereby linking the moral sense specifically to mortality).

¹¹⁴ Scholars do not agree on the general truth of Zeus' claim. In particular, Poseidon and Helios seem to bring trouble to mortals for selfish personal reasons. For rejections of Zeus' claim see Schadewaldt 1958b (offering the analytic perspective that Zeus' universal theodicy presents a more morally sophisticated and therefore more recent notion of justice than the older, vindictive notion of justice enacted by Helios and Poseidon; *sed contra*: Hölscher 1939, 81; Bona 1966, 23-39; Fenik 1974, 208-227, with bibliography; Friedrich 1987; Winterbottom 1989, 35-36; Reinhardt 1996, 84; cf. Segal 1992 for a less analytic but strong thematic separation of more primitive from more moral divine activity; Loudon 2001, 69-103; Haubold and Graziosi 2005, 79. For strong defenses of Zeus' claim see Kirk 1962, 291; Lloyd-Jones 1971 *passim*, esp. 27; Rutherford 1986; Segal 1992; Cook 1995, especially chapter 5 (reading many individual passages as moral lessons appropriate to a specifically democratic *polis*); Olson 1995, 213-220; Allan 2006. Rutherford 1986 appreciates the subtlety of the *Odyssey*'s treatment of morality, but draws too heavily on a view of human fragility derived mainly from Athenian tragedy. West 1988, 61 concedes that Poseidon's anger is privately motivated but denies that it has much effect.

¹¹⁵ Bakker 2013, 96-113 links Helios' vengeance on Odysseus' *hetairoi* with Odysseus' vengeance on the suitors, citing Helios' illumination of the suitors' corpses at *Odyssey* 22.383-389, observing that both groups of companions consumed meat impiously, thereby committing the (in Bakker's argument) arch-sin of an agricultural society that also subsists on (a finite supply of) domestic animals.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Clay 1984, 37 (taking the word *atasthalia* as generally placing blame on some as opposed to others).

the proem contrasts Odysseus and his *hetairoi* with respect to homecoming, Athena contrasts Odysseus and his *hetairoi* with respect to divine justice. He does not deserve their fate because, unlike his *hetairoi*, he has not brought destruction on himself:

ἀλλά μοι ἄμφ' Ὀδυσῆϊ δαΐφροني δαίεται ἦτορ,
δυσμόρῳ, ὃς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πῆματα πάσχει
...οὐ νότ' Ὀδυσσεὺς
Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ χαρίζετο ἱερὰ ῥέζων
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ; τί νό οἱ τόσον ὠδύσαο, Ζεῦ;
(*Odyssey* 1.48-49, 60-62)

Athena ends her speech with a rhetorical question, calculated to present Odysseus' sufferings as a clear disproof of Zeus' theodicy and demonstration of his arbitrary, unjust governance of the universe—if Odysseus remains on Ogygia. She strongly distinguishes Odysseus from those who deserve their sufferings—including Odysseus' own *hetairoi*, insofar as they are subsumed under Zeus' claim by the repeated phrase σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν. If Odysseus is the paradigm of the pious man suffering unjustly, his *hetairoi* are the first instance in the *Odyssey* of foolish men bringing suffering on themselves—and on an innocent Odysseus as well.

Athena's distinction introduces two key themes of the *Odyssey*—one in virtue of her claim itself, and the other in virtue of her vindication of her claim. First, she gives a cosmic and moral reason for the separation between Odysseus from his *hetairoi*. The proem said that one came home and the others did not; Athena says that one deserves to come home and the others

do not, because the one is just and the others committed *atasthalia*. Second, Athena identifies her two roles in the *Odyssey*: divine agent of Odysseus' return and enforcer of divine justice.¹¹⁷

The link between Athena's two roles implies two major contrasts between *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* and, concomitantly, the relation between humans and gods in the two poems. On the one hand, divine justice plays no part in the deaths of Iliadic *hetairoi*, and they are lamented and avenged with no reference to cosmic principle. But already by *Odyssey* 1.96 the deaths of Odysseus' *hetairoi* are both lamented and entirely just, because of the cosmic principle of retributive justice.¹¹⁸ On the other hand, in the *Iliad*, the gods have their own objectives: the Cyclical *boule* of Zeus, the vengeful anger of Hera and Athena, the loyal defense of the erotic by Aphrodite, the bloodlust of Ares.¹¹⁹ But in the *Odyssey*, the gods are playing at two levels; and their actions in the world are mainly influenced, not by their relations with other gods (as in the *Iliad*), but rather by their relations with mortals. Zeus demonstrates cosmic justice by citing mortal behavior. Poseidon tries to stop Odysseus from returning because his son

¹¹⁷ For bibliography on Athena's speech as prefiguring the plot of the *Odyssey* (especially her role in the poem) see Marks 2008, chapter 1 note 4.

¹¹⁸ For the thematic link between the self-destruction of the *hetairoi* and the killing of the suitors see Nagler 1990 ("that Odysseus (the 'savior of the oikos,' 2.59=17.538) has to kill his own retainers... is the central problem of the *Odyssey*": 345; cf. also Benardete 1997).

¹¹⁹ The *Iliad* refers only obliquely to the major motivators (depopulation, on the one hand, and the judgment of Paris, on the other) that appear explicitly in the *Cypria*. Thus the *Iliad* does not emphasize the specific mythical accounts of each god's allegiance that pre-existed the poem. Instead, the *Iliad* emphasizes the internecine aspect of strife on Olympus, presenting the Trojan plain as an arena in which the gods negotiate their own relationships with one another. See Redfield 1975 *passim*; Griffin 1980, 179-204; Kullmann 1985. For Iliadic gods as externalizations of human motivation, rather than motivated themselves, see Nilsson 1923. (Cf. *Iliad* 15.120ff, where Athena explicitly says that Zeus will abandon human matters and punish gods for intervening against his will.)

Polyphemus asks him to. Athena helps Odysseus return, partly because Odysseus himself longs to return¹²⁰ and partly because she appreciates his cleverness.¹²¹

The new order at the end of the *Odyssey*, comprising both divine harmony and cosmic justice, comes about in a single movement. Split over the justice of Odysseus' confinement in Book 1, Athena and Zeus reconcile only when Odysseus' victory is complete in Book 24.¹²² The passage that resolves the conflict between Zeus and Athena, the moment her roles as patron of Odysseus and enforcer of *dike* fully come together, is also Zeus' final act in Homeric epic—to grant Athena whatever she wishes:

οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον μὲν ἐβούλευσας νόον αὐτή,
ὥς ἦ τοι κείνους Ὀδυσεὺς ἀποτείσεται ἐλθών;
ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις· ἐρέω δέ τοι ὥς ἐπέουκεν.

(*Odyssey* 24.479-480)

The cosmic problem of the *Odyssey* is resolved as hero and family, aided by Athena-Mentor, rout their enemies without any warrior-*hetairoi*. But the phrase in which Zeus concedes decisive power to Athena echoes the passage in which the problem of the first epic is resolved—the moment Zeus unleashes Athena into the battle of vengeance for the dead *hetairos*:

.. ἐθέλω δέ τοι ἥπιος εἶναι·

¹²⁰ Athena at *Odyssey* 1.57-59: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς, / ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρόσκοντα νοῆσαι / ἥς γαίης, θανέειν ἱμείρεται.

¹²¹ For the “extraordinary intellectual communion of Athena and Odysseus” see Pucci 1998, 90-92. For the link between *nostos* and *noos* see Nagy 1990, chapter 4, following Frame 1978.

¹²² Cf. Marks 2008 (chapters 2 and 3: that the renewed divine council in *Odyssey* 5 already folds Athena's plan into Zeus' will; chapter 3: that Zeus' assent to Athena is necessary for the plot to resolve).

ἔρξον ὅπῃ δὴ τοι νόος ἔπλετο, μὴ δ' ἔτ' ἐρώει.

(*Iliad* 22.184-185)

Thus the central *skandalon* of both epics is resolved when Zeus tells Athena to do whatever (ἔρξον ὅπ-) she wants (ἐθέλεις...τοι νόος ἔπλετο). The wills of father-god and daughter-god are one at radically contrasting moments of *hetaireia*. In the *Iliad*, what Athena wants is that Achilles should kill Hector for killing his *hetairos* Patroclus. In the *Odyssey*, what Athena wants is that Odysseus' family should rout the forces assembled to avenge the deaths of the suitors. The former is about *hetaireia* in battle—a military bond unreduced to justice human or divine. The latter is about cosmic justice on behalf of the royal family—accomplished only by *hetaireia* between divinity and king.¹²³

* * *

Thus the conjunction of slaves and kin, on the one hand—constituents of the *oikos*, in other words—and Athena-Mentor, on the other, provides Odysseus the physical and moral support, respectively, that *hetairoi* gave heroes in the *Iliad*.¹²⁴ As Homer signals the importance

¹²³ For Odysseus *qua* king as father to his people (*Odyssey* 2.234: πατήρ..ἦεν) see Calhoun 1935 (reading early Greek monarchy in general through tribal patriarchy signified by Zeus' epithets); Finley 1978, 84; Olson 1995; Wöhrle 1999; Gottesmann 2014. Both selected and averted forms of inheritance derive from the *oikos*: the son might inherit kingship from his father, or the suitors might inherit kingship by marrying the queen. No one enjoys separate, extra-legal command by virtue of anything like an Iliadic *aristeia* except Odysseus himself on Ithaca; and his simultaneously martial and royal triumph comes after he returns home with no ships at all. For Homeric kings as dispensers of justice see Bonner and Smith 1938, 1.129-130.

¹²⁴ For the primacy of the *oikos* see e.g. Finley 1970, 84-85; 1977, 33, 111; 1978, 84-85, 91; Long 1970, 121-139; Adkins 1972, 17; Redfield 1975, 123-127; Morris 1986 (the *Iliad* includes both cooperative, *polis*-centric and competitive, aristocratic, *oikos*-centric ethics, but ideologically prefers the latter); Rose 1997. For the opposing view see e.g. Luce 1978, 8 (the values of the *polis* trump the values of the *oikos*); Donlan 1979 (even the most powerful *basileus* retain power only by virtue of their positive relation to the group); Scully 1990 (agreeing with Morris' picture of two layers but presenting the Iliadic *polis* as sacred and cultured); Raaflaub 1997. For ancient sensitivity to Homeric political values see Scodel 2009, 87-89 and 173-177.

of the self-destruction of the *hetairoi* by placing them at the climax of Odysseus' list of sorrows in Book 1, so he prepares the audience for the replacement of *hetaireia* by showing Athena set in motion the plot by appearing to Telemachus (kin) in the form of Mentos (*xenos*) and then, crucially, Mentor (*hetairos*), a disguise she retains throughout the poem. The *Odyssey* poet makes Telemachus encounter *hetaireia* first as voluntary (the group of sailors Athena-Mentor assembles for him) then as departed and non-military (the *hetairoi* returning from Troy in Nestor's and Menelaus' stories); he shows the suitors constructing their own desperate and destructive *hetaireia*, thereby digging their own grave.

By the end of the *Odyssey*, *heta(i)r-* signifies three different kinds of relationship. The *de facto hetaireia* that dominates the *Iliad* dissolves as Odysseus' *hetairoi* destroy themselves and as the suitors fail to fight together as *hetairoi*. This warrior-*hetaireia* is gone by the end of *Odyssey* 24. The first kind of *hetaireia* that remains is the voluntary *hetaireia* that appears once in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*, and has only temporary effect. As the Idomeneus of the *Iliad* fights for Agamemnon because he "swore and assented" to be his *hetairos*—a phrase that implies that the *hetaireia* between Agamemnon and Idomeneus first came into existence off the battlefield (as opposed to the *ad hoc, de facto hetaireia* of the rest of the *Iliad*),¹²⁵ so also Telemachus in the *Odyssey* receives a group of twenty voluntary *hetairoi* for his fact-finding expedition to Pylos and Sparta, a group of sailors that dissolves as soon as the expedition is over. The second kind of *hetaireia* obtains among slaves, specifically between Eumaios and his swineherd-*hetairoi*. The third kind of *hetaireia* obtains only between the royal family and the gods. This *hetaireia* appears only in the *Odyssey*. The phrase *patrios hetairos*, unique to the

¹²⁵ *Iliad* 4.266-267: μέν τοι ἐγὼν ἐρίηρος ἑταῖρος / ἔσσομαι, ὥς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα, discussed in Chapter 1.

Odyssey, signifies both the familial aspect of this kind of *hetaireia*—and also its link with the divine, insofar as *patrios hetairos* refers most frequently and most prominently to Mentor, who figures in the *Odyssey* almost entirely as Athena's favorite disguise.

The *Odyssey* ends with the *hetairos* who is actually an Olympian goddess re-enthroning a man who begins the poem imprisoned by a lesser goddess and thwarted by blameworthy, self-destructive *hetairoi*. The winners are the royal household, never called *hetairoi*; the losers are pretenders to his household and throne, whose last vain attempt to identify as *hetairoi* is immediately undercut by the king's revelation and by their own failure to respond as warrior-companions. The *hetaireia* of the *Iliad* is gone and forgotten. Something new, both mundane and divine, has replaced it.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND POSTSCRIPT

Introduction

The preceding four chapters traced the nature and meaning of *hetaireia*, its role in battle, its effect on plot and character, and its dissolution and replacement over the course of Homeric epic. A major shift occurred between the beginning of the *Iliad* and the end of the *Odyssey*. At first, in the *Iliad*, *hetairoi* are warrior-companions, responsible for others' survival and success, and the death of Achilles' *hetairos* drives the plot to its bloody climax. By the end of the *Odyssey*, these warrior-companions have disappeared; instead, family and gods fill the hero's social world, and the plot concludes with an image of Athena *hetairos* staving off bloodshed. The world of Achilles is dominated by *hetaireia*; the world of Odysseus comes to be dominated by *oikos* and god. Peace replaces war as peacetime relationships, both familial and religious, replace warrior-companionship.

In the following pages I review and summarize specific original observations about Iliadic and Odyssean worlds presented in the previous four chapters and suggest some broader consequences for disciplines beyond Homeric studies. First I summarize five effects of the dissolution and replacement of *hetaireia* on the transition from *Iliad* 1 to *Odyssey* 24. Then I consider some non-literary implications of the nature of *hetaireia* in the *Iliad* and its disappearance in the *Odyssey*, viewing Homeric *hetaireia* through cultural-historical, social-historical, psychological, philosophical, and military-historical lenses. Finally, I offer a prospective glance at *hetaireia* and military companionship after Homer—beginning with the

observation that, after the *Odyssey* and before the rise of Macedon, *heta(i)r-* almost never refers to warriors, often carries erotic overtones, and sometimes connotes political danger.

1. Effects of changing *hetaireia* on the transition from *Iliad* 1 to *Odyssey* 24

The dissolution and replacement of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* changes five major features of the social and cultural world in which the *Iliad* begins. One is purely military; one is psychological; two are social and political; the last is theological. All have been treated at various lengths in the four chapters above. The following section serves to summarize and treat these five changing features together.

1.1 Causes of success in battle

In the *Iliad*, success in battle comes from being best (*aristos*) at fighting; and the *aristos* warrior is bound by the strongest *hetaireia*, both to one individual and to his entire contingent. Warriors fight for their warrior-companions more than for anything else, and most attempts to protect or avenge *hetairoi* are successful. When the best Achaean enters battle only to avenge his *hetairos*, he is invincible to humans and nearly invincible to gods.¹ When the best Trojan ignores his *hetairoi* in favor of kin, he dies at the hands of the avenger of the *hetairos* he killed and thereby proleptically loses his entire city.² But in the *Odyssey*, *hetairoi* lose battles, whereas stratagem and divine intervention bring victory.

Moreover, in the *Iliad*, *hetaireia* joins physical and moral factors in combat. Iliadic *hetairoi* always bring both courage and physical support. The *Odyssey* treats these two factors

¹ See Whitman 1958 for the most powerful treatment of Achilles' status as *hemitheos* in Homer (with Slatkin 1991 for mythical background); Zanker 1994 for the intensity and complexity of Achilles' emotions; Kim 2000 for the less violent side (pity) of Achilles' affective response to death.

² See especially Redfield 1975 and Chapter 2 above, under "Weak *hetaireia* II: Hector and the Trojans."

separately. The mental *metis* is opposed to the physical *bie* and overcomes it.³ Odysseus' *hetairoi* weaken him both physically and mentally. His new supporters on Ithaca are family and slaves, not *hetairoi*. The divine interventions that decide the outcome of the two final battles are predominantly psychological.⁴

The disappearance of *hetaireia* as a factor in battle also contributes to the growing importance of numbers in battle. In the *Iliad*, Agamemnon brings the largest contingent but does not clearly command the largest number of troops in battle.⁵ Heroes accomplish their *aristeiai* almost entirely alone. The actions of masses in combat, including the relative sizes of each mass, do not determine the outcome. Nor does physical magnitude prove decisive for individual success in combat.⁶ But the actions of *hetairoi*, and of warriors in response to *hetairoi*, do determine the course of battle. Thus the presence of *hetaireia* makes all the difference, but the number of *hetairoi* makes no difference.

In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, relative quantities do make a difference in battle. The Ciconian counterattack overwhelms the *hetairoi* because the new force is larger than the old.⁷

³ Detienne and Vernant 1974 remains the most thorough treatment of *metis* and is often cited in fields besides classics (especially organizational and knowledge management).

⁴ See discussion in Chapter 2, under "Psychological warfare: Athena's new role in battle and the autonomy of morale." (For the importance of Athena as morale provider relative to Odysseus' fellow human combatants cf. Napoleon's famous maxim: "The moral is to the physical as three to one.")

⁵ In the Catalogue of Ships the Achaeans outnumber the Trojans by as much as two to one, and Agamemnon has more ships than anyone else by twenty-five percent; but the difference is not reflected in combat scenes. Occasionally the poet comments that, although Trojans are fewer (*παυροτέροις*), Achaeans cannot push them back (e.g. *Iliad* 15.406-407), but this merely shows that size of contingent in general does not determine the outcome of battle. The question of the relative size of contingents is different from the general problem of masses in Homer, on which the scholarship is extensive; see especially Albracht 1886 and Latacz 1977 (more bibliography in general introduction to this dissertation).

⁶ Ajax is larger than Achilles but Achilles is the superior warrior.

⁷ *Odyssey* 9.48 (*ἄμα πλέονες καὶ ἀρείους*), discussed in Chapter 3.

The size of one Cyclops makes him incomparably stronger than a hero with multiple human *hetairoi*.⁸ The suitors are a serious threat because they are many. The *demos* is capable of defeating the suitors because the size of the *demos* is greater still.⁹ The presence of *hetaireia* makes no difference: the greater is stronger whether opposed by *hetairoi* or not.¹⁰

1.2 Objects of *peith/pist*

In the *Iliad*, warriors trust *hetairoi* with their lives. This trust is so well-founded that warriors are not even called *hetairoi* unless they are acting in close support. But in the *Odyssey*, warrior-*hetairoi* cannot be trusted even to take care of themselves, let alone to protect a warrior in need. The suitor-*hetairoi* are not even trustworthy among themselves. The only humans Odysseus eventually trusts are members of the *oikos*—family and slaves. But Odysseus does not trust even these humans without testing them first.¹¹

Moreover, in the *Iliad*, humans do not trust gods at all. The actions of the gods are determined by independent factors and paradigmatically beyond human control.¹² But in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus comes to trust Athena implicitly after she berates him for trusting her less

⁸ The Laestrygonians are large in both number and body: μυρίοι, οὐκ ἄνδρεςσιν ἐοικότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν (*Odyssey* 10.120).

⁹ *Odyssey* 2.235-242 (Mentor berating the *demos* for failing to drive out the suitors as many to few: παύρους μνηστήρας κατέρυκετε πολλοὶ ἐόντες), discussed in Chapter 4.

¹⁰ Contrast the safety consistently offered by the band of Iliadic *hetairoi*, even against such powerful warriors as Ajax and Aeneas. The exception is Patroclus, whose *ethnos hetairon* cannot protect him against Hector. See discussion of the *ethnos hetairon* in Chapter 2.

¹¹ For Odysseus' obsession with testing see discussion in Chapter 4, under "Laertes the warrior-father." For Agamemnon's test in *Iliad* 2, which scholars usually but (surprisingly) not always interpret as abject failure, see Chapter 2, note 61.

¹² For the differing role of the gods in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* see "Athena *hetairos*" in Chapter 4, with bibliography in note 11.

than anyone would trust his mortal *hetairos*.¹³ She takes the form of his *hetairos* as she earns the trust enjoyed by all Iliadic *hetairoi* and gives Odysseus joy.¹⁴

1.3 Sources of military and royal authority

In the *Iliad*, heroes lead effectively in combat when they treat nearby warriors as independent agents, often explicitly under the name *hetairoi*. The worst commander splits one group of *hetairoi* from another, shares few feelings with his men, and acts as if his office entitled him to ignore the feelings and material concerns of his warriors.¹⁵ The best commander addresses other warriors as *hetairoi*, consistently treats them with sympathy, and ultimately rectifies his failure to lead his *hetairoi* in battle. But in the *Odyssey*, the hero endangers his *hetairoi* for personal reasons, ignores their good advice, and as a result loses their trust and eventually his command. The *hetairoi* themselves fare no better: they prove themselves incapable of returning home without being rescued and sometimes even coerced by their commander.

Moreover, in the *Iliad*, supreme authority comes to Agamemnon from Zeus based on no specific qualification except that he brings the largest number of ships.¹⁶ The effective leader at

¹³ *Odyssey* 20.45, discussed under “Trust before battle: divine Athena rather than mortal *hetairoi*” in Chapter 4. For *peith/pist* in the *Iliad* see Chapter 1, under “The *pathos* of *hetaireia* II: the death of the *pistos hetairos*.”

¹⁴ For courage and joy from Athena see Chapter 4 under “Athena *hetairos*,” especially “Reviving the hero’s spirited body: Odysseus’ secret *hetairos* in the *agon*.”

¹⁵ For Agamemnon’s failure to understand the army see Chapter 2, under “Weak *hetaireia* I: Agamemnon and the Achaeans.”

¹⁶ Zeus gives unshared *time* to kings: ἐπεὶ οὐ ποθ’ ὁμοίης ἔμπορε τιμῆς / σκηπτουῖχος βασιλεύς, ᾧ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν (Nestor at *Iliad* 1.278-279). Zeus loves kings and give them *time*: θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ διοτρεφέων βασιλῶν, / τιμὴ δ’ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστι, φιλεῖ δὲ ἐμνήστια Ζεὺς (Odysseus at *Iliad* 2.196-197). Zeus gives scepter and laws to one king only, in order that he may rule: εἷς βασιλεύς, ᾧ δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω / σκῆπτρόν τ’ ἠδὲ θέμιστας, ἵνα σφισι βουλευῇσι (*Iliad* 2.205-206). For royal authority in the *Iliad* see e.g. Finsler 1906; Stanford 1955 (Odysseus at 2.205-206 as “proto-evangelist of hierarchical order in European thought”), 1974; Finley 1957 and 1978, 84 (incorrectly failing to distinguish between *anax* and *basileus*); Donlan 1979 (authority in general derives

any particular moment is simply whichever hero happens to be in the midst of his *aristeia*, no matter how many ships he commands, but the office of supreme *wanax* is not in question.¹⁷ In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, kingship is entirely a function of the *oikos*, and *oikos*-determined kingship is enforced by the gods.¹⁸ Outside of the *oikos*, Odysseus' *hetairoi* can overthrow him on Thrinakia for poor leadership and follow someone else, just as the suitors plot to overthrow the returning king and replace him on the Ithacan throne.

1.4 The role of violence in society

Violence in the *Iliad* is war: it occurs between armies and warriors of roughly equal strength. Because *hetaireia* is the bond that joins heroes and warriors, *hetaireia* is the most important relationship in a poem about the *hetairos*-avenging rage of Achilles during an episode in the Trojan war. The dynamics of military society are determined by *hetaireia* at all levels, from the reasons warriors die and risk their lives to the clustering and movements of the *ethnos hetairon* that determine the outcome of battle. But in the *Odyssey*, after the slaughter by the Cicones, violence never occurs between armies and generally takes place between unequals.¹⁹

from balance of position, standing, and collectivity; many episodes consist of rebalancing these three); Griffin 1980, 10 (scepter as sign of coercive royal authority; cf., more speculatively, Mondi 1980); de Ste. Croix 1982, 279, 413 (aristocratic audience of the *Iliad* would support Odysseus against Thersites because royal authority in archaic Greece is necessarily exclusive); Rihll 1987 (no *basileus*, not even Zeus, is consistently obeyed without negotiation); Thalmann 1988 (Agamemnon's *peira* in book 2 shows how thoroughly royal authority depends on Zeus); McGlew 1989 (shame drives obedience to the king); Hitch 2009 (Agamemnon derives royal authority from unique dominance of sacrifice).

¹⁷ At *Iliad* 1.190-222, Achilles does not consider overthrowing Agamemnon; he considers murdering him.

¹⁸ For *hetaireia* between god and royal family see Chapter 4, under "Athena *hetairos*."

¹⁹ I mean between different kinds of fighting entities exerting different kinds of violence: between humans and monsters; heroes and magical women; the assembled warrior-class of Ithaca and surrounding islands against a beggar, a boy, and two slaves.

No Odyssean society is military; even *hetairoi* themselves are civilians.²⁰ Killing in the *Iliad* is lamentable, as if seen through the eyes of the dead warrior's *hetairoi*. But killing in the *Odyssey* is either a matter of fantasy or a punishment for injustice. The deaths of Odysseus' *hetairoi* at the hands of monsters are lamented over and over, but the killing of the suitors is never shown through the eyes of the bereaved *hetairoi* of the dead.²¹

1.5 The relationship between humans and gods

The gods of the *Iliad* are not joined with humans in friendship, let alone the sort of intimate bond signified by *heta(i)r-*.²² Iliadic *hetaireia* binds only humans with humans; in the *Iliad*, nothing but blood joins particular humans with particular gods. The general matter of divine attachment to mortals is so far from Homer's purpose that the incident explaining which gods have joined which human group is virtually suppressed.²³ But the gods of the *Odyssey* are personally and intimately joined with or opposed to certain humans, and the causes of their interests in mortal affairs are emphasized repeatedly starting in the first book.²⁴ Athena declares her special affinity for Odysseus that derives from their shared interest in cleverness and

²⁰ Sailors or suitors, even though Odysseus' sailor-hetairoi *were* warriors; but their departure from Iliadic warrior status is emphasized in the initial success at Ismarus, in the disastrous counterattack by the Cicones

²¹ The suitors' families are angry and vengeful, but they are kin, not warrior-companions. Even the families' sorrow is mentioned only briefly (groaning: *στοναχῆ* at 24.416; grieving at heart: *ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ* at line 420; Eupheithes' grief (*πένθος*: 423) and weeping (*δάκρυ χέων*: 425), but these appear within a space of nine lines, and the speech is mostly about revenge.

²² For Hermes at *Iliad* 24.335 (*ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι*) see Chapter 4 under "*Xenos to hetairos*: Mentos to Mentor."

²³ For the rather oblique reference to the judgment of Paris at *Iliad* 24.22-30 (which Aristarchus particularly disliked) see especially Reinhardt 1948, 11-46 and Davies 1981.

²⁴ For the divine investment in human affairs see "Cosmic justice and Odysseus' *nostos*: Athena-hetairos' twofold mission" in Chapter 4.

deception. She is called his *hetairos*, something that no god is ever called in the *Iliad*, and she repeatedly intervenes in the form of Odysseus' *hetairos* Mentor.²⁵

2. Non-literary implications beyond the world of epic

If, as I argue in Chapter 1, *hetaireia* is the most important relationship in the *Iliad*; and if, as I argue in Chapter 2, *hetaireia* is the most important motivator in battle; then the disappearance and replacement of *hetaireia* over the course of the *Odyssey* signifies more than literary closure, and this dissertation has more than literary-critical implications. This postscript describes some such implications.

2.1a Cultural history I: the importance of *kleos* within and outside the world of epic

Homeric heroes and non-heroic warriors rarely seek *kleos* in battle. It is therefore necessary to distinguish two perspectives on *kleos* in our accounts of Homeric narrative. The first perspective is located outside the world of epic and accounts for epic as performance. From this perspective it is quite certain, as Nagy and many others have observed, that poets perform epic in

²⁵ The intimacy between gods and men implied by presenting Athena as *hetairos*—or at least the intimacy between Athena and the king in particular—is not adequately represented by the common and, in a different way, accurate observation that the Odyssean gods are generally more remote than the Iliadic gods (e.g. Kullman 1985). Zeus is distant while Athena is close; and the tension and eventual resolution of their relationship appears both immediately after Zeus' theodicy in Book 1 and at the very close of the battle against the suitors' families in Book 24. Viewed from this Olympian perspective, the action of the *Odyssey* begins with Zeus and Athena in conflict (where he claims that humans suffer only justly, and Athena cites Odysseus as a counterexample) and ends with the two reconciled on precisely the issue over which they first came into conflict (Odysseus is now justly returned to his throne in Ithaca). The two simultaneous significances of Odysseus' return as (a) reaffirmation of royal power and (b) identification of *oikos* with the community at large more abstractly encodes the reconciliation of Zeus and Athena: the reaffirmation of Zeus' divine *dike* over the *cosmos* comes only when father and daughter both agree on the rule of the universe. In the *Odyssey* this happens only—and emphatically, via the presentation of Athena as morale-focused *hetairos*—because Athena becomes more intimate with humans than the Iliadic gods ever were. (For Athena's special intimacy with Athens in cult, a divine-human intimacy connected closely (since Solon) with Athena's intimacy with her father, see Herington 1965. For the *Odyssey* and Athenian cult see Cook 1995.)

order to give heroes *kleos aphthiton*.²⁶ That thesis is entirely consistent with the findings of this dissertation.

The second perspective belongs to the Homeric warrior himself and is thus located within the world of epic. From this internal perspective *kleos* is comparatively unimportant: *kleos* is named explicitly as motivator in only nine Iliadic passages, and fame or recognition without lexical constraints (including *kudos*) appears in only eight more.²⁷ By contrast, *hetaireia*—defined as desire to protect, avenge, or lament warrior-companions—motivates warriors to kill, risk their lives, or die in one hundred and twenty-one passages. But *hetaireia* dominates Iliadic combat motivation in two layers. Tabulation and analysis in the appendix show that, in the vast majority of cases, warriors are motivated by *hetaireia* in battle. This is the first, crudely statistical layer, already discussed. The second layer concerns the central events of the poem and the motivation of the central hero in particular. No tabulation is necessary to show that Achilles enters battle in order to avenge Patroclus. Moreover, as the first two chapters of the dissertation show, Achilles' *hetaireia* with Patroclus is unique, insofar as in no other case are two individuals each called *hetairos* of the other, and yet normative, insofar as their unique bond allows both to inspire the Myrmidons to fight—first when Patroclus rouses them by appeal to their *hetaireia* with Achilles, and second when Achilles rouses them by appeal to their *hetaireia* with dead Patroclus.

²⁶ For *kleos* in Indo-European epic see Nagy 1974 and 1990 (equating Homeric *kleos aphthiton* with Vedic *êrâvo âksitam* and *âksiti êrâva*); Floyd 1980 (discussing many post-Homeric examples of the phrase, with special attention to the role of the gods); Finkelberg 1986 (arguing on technical Lord-Parryan grounds that *kleos aphthiton* cannot be formulaic in Homer; rejected as too technically rigid in Edwards 1988 and Watkins 1995, 173-178) and 2007 (responding to technical objections); Olson 1995, 1-23 (most modifiers of *kleos* describe value and expansiveness, not temporal longevity). For the role of *kleos* in flyting speeches see Mackie 1996, chapter 3, esp. 90-93.

²⁷ Instances of fame, glory, renown *vel sim* are all included in this count, not just uses of the special epic term *kleos*. For passages and further classification see appendix.

2.1b Cultural history II: importance of *time* in and out of battle

Similarly, Homeric heroes rarely seek *time* in battle. Here two kinds of circumstance must be distinguished. As to the first kind, the non-military: it is clear, as Adkins, Donlan, van Wees, and others have shown,²⁸ that *time* motivates individuals in conversation and in council.²⁹ But as to the second circumstance, that is, in the heat of battle: *time* (whether or not explicitly so-called) motivates warriors to kill, risk their lives, and die in only three passages; and in two of these cases the motivated warrior is Agamemnon, whose excessive concern for *time* in Book 1 causes countless Achaean deaths.

That motivation should vary with circumstance is not surprising. Modern combat theorists strongly distinguish the pre-battle and in-battle motivation, and military psychologists consider both kinds of motivation for the sake of post-combat therapy.³⁰ Moreover, combat motivation seems to vary by culture primarily in pre-battle contexts. Post-Napoleonic nationalism draws soldiers into modern armies but has no place in a world before the Westphalian nation-state, let alone an expedition composed of volunteers.³¹ In a world before the *polis* even non-ethnic localized patriotism has very little clout, and accordingly ethnic identity has very little place in Homer.³² When a culture heavily values status, *time* can indeed motivate

²⁸ For bibliography on Homeric values in and out of combat see general introduction.

²⁹ For conversation in groups see Beck 2005, chapter 5; for collective decision-making see Elmer 2012.

³⁰ For combat motivation and post-combat psychotherapy see discussion below, with note 49. Crowley 2012 applies these theories to the Athenian hoplite with more sophistication than many earlier ancient historians (critiqued in Wheeler 2011). Following the analysis of King 2013, Iliadic *hetairoi* are motivated like modern professional volunteers (as Achilles argues in book 1), while Athenian hoplites (as Crowley describes them) are motivated like citizen-soldiers (e.g. pre-AVF).

³¹ For the role of nationalism in combat motivation see King 2013, chapter 4 (esp. 74-77, with bibliography).

³² For ethnic groups in early Greece see Hall 2000; McNerny 2001; Skinner 2012, 3-59. For the panhellenism of the *Iliad* see Snodgrass 1971, 55-57, 419-421, 434-436; Nagy 1979, 115-117; Ross 2005; for the opposing view, Finley 1978, 18 (noting that the Achaeans are one group, but heterogeneous); Cartledge 1995, 77-78 (because there is no

warriors to enter battle. But *hetaireia* dominates as soon as the battle begins. Discussions of ethical values in Homer that do not thoroughly distinguish examples of in-battle and pre-battle decisions to reconstruct a single value system thus do not recognize the overwhelming shift in motivational structure that combat itself brings about—no matter how complex the reconstructed value system.³³

2.2 Social history: the irreducibility of *hetaireia*

Modern social histories of the ancient world also do not typically distinguish relationships primarily by circumstance. For example, *philia* between two individuals moves both individuals to act differently in different circumstances, but the bond itself is not determined by battle. But in Homeric epic, *hetaireia* is activated specifically in battle. Iliadic warriors are called *hetairoi* only because they are nearby and can or do offer or receive help in battle. Even in the *Odyssey*, where human *hetaireia* no longer emerges *de facto* from battle, kings can make slaves *hetairoi* in return for sufficient support in combat.³⁴ Peace, therefore, is neither prerequisite for *hetaireia* nor even its normal circumstance of origin. In this as well as in other respects discussed in Chapter 1, *hetaireia* cannot be reduced to any other social relationship.

While it is impossible to conclude much about social realities from Homer alone, it is dangerous to dismiss epic as sheer fantasy,³⁵ and in any case the relationships among Homeric warriors—particularly Achilles and Patroclus, the only two mutual *hetairoi*—became paradigms

concept of the barbarian as other to the Hellenes); Mackie 1996 (Achaean speech is more masculine and aggressive); Konstan 2001; Neal 2006 (Achaeans respond stoically to wounds, while wounded Trojans wail like women).

³³ For Homeric values see general introduction. Zanker 1994 is sensitive to differing values in different contexts but does not recognize the specific effect of combat on what motivates individual warriors.

³⁴ See Chapter 4, under “Eumaios, Philoitios, Dolios and sons: warrior-slaves.”

³⁵ For scholarship on the reality of Homer’s world see general introduction.

for later Greek ethical and political thought.³⁶ *Hetaireia* is intimate but is not *philia*; appears in a specific context but is not *xenia*; obtains between non-equals but is not the relation of the ruler to the *laoi*. The irreducibility of *hetaireia* entails two new problems in social history: (1) why does military *hetaireia* disappear after Homer? and (2) why do *hetairoi* after Homer become symposiastic aristocrats, philosophers, and courtesans? Presumably the elite see some analogy between Homeric warriors and themselves; but even if the application of this analogy at least partly accounts for the change in usage, it does not describe how this analogy relates the analogates, nor why the military aspect of *hetaireia*—which is absolutely essential to Iliadic *hetaireia*—disappears, nor why the meaning shifts toward intoxication, *eros*, and philosophy. Chapter 3 of this dissertation discusses how Iliadic *hetaireia* breaks down and what replaces it in the *Odyssey*; but the line from *Odyssey* 24 to Theognis to Socrates and Alcibiades remains to be drawn.

2.3 Philosophy: the unique semantics of *hetaireia*

The derivation of *hetairos* from **swe-*, combined with the fact that *hetaireia* emerges specifically in battle, suggests a profound connection between the semantics of the self and the circumstances in which the self is conceived in relation to others.³⁷ In battle, the life of the

³⁶ For ancient sources see Clarke 1978. For the debate on the role of *eros* in the relationship of Achilles and Patroclus see Sergent 1986, 250-258. Most recently see the intertextual study by Fantuzzi (2012), especially 1-6. Whatever may be gleaned from close reading of specific Iliadic passages, Achilles and Patroclus are far less clearly lovers in Homer than in Aeschylus, Aeschines, Plato, and Theocritus.

³⁷ Benveniste 1973, book 2, chapter 3 offers some philosophical speculation along similar lines. Two cognates not treated by Benveniste suggest another possible link between the warrior and the self in Indo-European thought. Latin *sodalis* appears as a synonym for *hetairos* in the Code of Justinian, but not in the Latin epic or historiographic tradition (Curtius uses *socius* and *comes* for Macedonians described by Arrian as *hetairoi*). Dumezil, 1970, 62-64 links Sanskrit *svá-* compounds, which often describe Indra's warrior-band, to Latin *sodalis* on the grounds that Indra's Maruts and Latin *sodales* are both highly exclusive, sometimes secretive, and often dangerous. In Greek this semantic field seems to match post-Homeric far better than Iliadic *heta(i)r-*, but the connection with warrior-companions is interesting.

warrior and the actions of his neighbor are evidently inseparable. The military self is existentially dependent on the warrior-companions, in the sense that the continued existence of one warrior depends on the actions of those nearby. Thus it seems semantically natural that nearby warrior-companions should be named by a word deriving from the reflexive.

Hetaireia therefore has a unique place in the aetiology of human relationships viewed through the lens of Ionian philosophy: for *hetairoi* are to warriors with respect to being what parents are with respect to becoming. It is the *hetairos* as such who accounts for the persistent being of a warrior in battle, just as it is the parent as such who accounts for the becoming of a human being.³⁸ Any individual might accidentally account for someone being or coming to be—for example, respectively, a farmer who provides food or a matchmaker who introduces parents—but warrior-companions are named from **swe-*, that is in relation to the self, precisely when they are actually protecting, avenging, or lamenting the individual to whom they are related.³⁹

Hetaireia has two additional implications for ancient ethics. First, while all warrior-companions depend on one another to remain alive in battle, heroes and their *hetairoi* are not equal in nature. One is always stronger than the other, and the stronger is not normally called *hetairos*—but they are both equally *good*, in the sense that both equally strive to keep the other safe, and both equally need the other in order to remain alive in battle. The Iliadic concept of *hetaireia* thus avoids extremes of both egoism, in which the other is ethically reduced to the

³⁸ For the warrior as preserver in Indo-European myth see Dumezil 1970; Lincoln 1980. For the Maruts, the quintessential Vedic warrior-band (often modified by the epithet *evayâh*, ‘swift’), as companions of Vishnu the Preserver see Chakravarty 1991.

³⁹ For the anger as desire, with pain, to avenge (ὀρεξίς μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας) an injury to oneself or a particular associate (εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ) see Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1378a30, with Konstan 2003.

self—insofar as the non-*hetairos* owes his life to the *hetairos*—and altruism, in which the self disappears altogether—insofar as the *hetairos* owes his life to the non-*hetairos* as well.⁴⁰

Second, *hetairoi* provide exemplary solutions to a major problem in ancient Greek ethics since Pythagoras, namely, the tension between the supreme valuation of ontological independence and the equally high value placed on friendship.⁴¹ Aristotle famously resolves this tension by describing the friend as “another self” (ἄλλος αὐτός).⁴² But a similar solution is already both presented and problematized in Homer. The word *hetairos* describes a life-saving/avenging/lamenting warrior in reflexive relation to the self, and the pairing of Achilles and Patroclus (the only mutual *hetairoi*) both offers a case of “another self” and shows how the over-identification of Patroclus with Achilles spirals into disaster.⁴³

2.5 Military psychology: *hetaireia* and the primary group

⁴⁰ For a recent overview of egoism and altruism in ancient ethics, including neo-Aristotelian critique of Kant’s “distortive focus on the beneficiary,” see Biniek 2013, chapter 2.

⁴¹ For the “eudaimonistic paradox” of Aristotelian friendship see especially Annas 1977; Irwin 1980; Kahn 1981; Kraut 1991; more bibliography in Biniek 2013.

⁴² For Aristotle’s “other self” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1166a30-34), see e.g. Annas 1977; Kraut 1989; McKerlie 1991; Whiting 2006; Carreras 2012.

⁴³ For Patroclus as Achilles’ substitute (signified by *therapon*, not *hetairos*) see Nagy 1979, 33, 292-293; Sinos 1980; Lowenstam 1981, 126-131, 174-177. For the Indo-European concept of ritual substitution see van Brock 1959.

In modern theories of combat psychology, warriors fight primarily for one another;⁴⁴ for their commander; and for the success of the unit.⁴⁵ The tabulation of motivation in Iliadic battle, presented in the appendix, shows the same motivational structure.⁴⁶ Desire to protect, avenge, or lament companions in battle moves warriors to kill, risk their lives, and die more than anything

⁴⁴ The Freudian term “primary group” is still commonly applied to the military unit (usually the platoon), following Shils and Janowitz 1948. The military primary group does two things: it provides soldiers the necessities of life (food, shelter, safety); and it makes comradeship possible (specifically by maintaining a loving paternal relationship between group leaders and members, which in turn allows members to love one another as brothers). Cooley 1909, 23 (cited by Shils and Janowitz) conceives the primary group as “a ‘we’; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which ‘we’ is the natural expression.” Henderson 1985 discusses in detail the many specific activities that generate unit cohesion, most of which can be classified as either dependence or love, and often both at once. Henderson’s evidence comes mainly from particulars of American, British, North Vietnamese, and Soviet military practice, not the (possibly non-generalizable) Wehrmacht treated by Shils and Janowitz.

⁴⁵ Marshall 1947, 42-43 famously describes the modern orthodoxy as follows: “I hold it to be one of the simplest truths of war that the thing which enables an infantry soldier to keep going with his weapons is the near presence or the presumed presence of a comrade. The warmth which derives from human companionship is as essential to his employment of the arms with which he fights as is the finger with which he pulls a trigger...[the soldier] is sustained by his fellows primarily and by his weapons secondarily”. Ardant du Picq (1921) is often credited as the single most important direct influence on the modern appreciation of moral element in combat, but the three most influential twentieth-century studies of combat motivation (Marshall 1947, Shils and Janowitz 1948, and Stouffer 1949) were motivated, not by theory or du Picq’s detailed case-studies, but by extensive empirical work by American and British military physicians on soldiers in World War II, which showed that physical and psychiatric casualty rates correlated too strongly to be explained by *ex ante* differences in psychological disposition (for statistics see Jones and Wessely 2001; for sources see Anderson and Glass 1966), contradicting earlier claims that the moral character of the individual determined whether or not “shell shock” took hold and rendered a soldier combat ineffective. Only late in World War II did military psychiatrists recognize that combat itself is enough to undo any mind, given sufficiently long and intense exposure (Janowitz 1971, 26) – although many individuals had already observed this; see e.g. Moran 1945. As a result military psychiatrists began to focus less on prevention (by screening and indoctrination, as had been attempted throughout World War I and in the early years of World War II) and more on the universal experience of combat. Kellett 1982 represents the universalist position (to ancient historians as well: see Wheeler 2011) clearly. See also Henderson 1987 for different manifestations of comradeship in several modern armies (emphasizing the concept of cohesion). For a recent push-back against the universalist theory see King 2013, who argues strongly that cohesion in citizen-armies depends heavily on ideology (both patriotic and masculine) while in volunteer armies (e.g. the American ‘AVF’) cohesion derives mainly from professional association (although see also three reviews, with King’s replies to each, in Siebold, Crabb, Woodward, and King 2015). King’s professionals, however, are neither the “beings-for-death” of the Indo-European Männerbünde nor the “pure warriors” described by comparative anthropology (e.g. Clastres 1988, 221-222). Grossman 1996 is an important non-scholarly take on the psychology of killing (although Grossman takes as a jumping-off point Marshall’s “ratio of fire” numbers, which have not been reproduced and were reported inconsistently by Marshall himself, according to Spiller 1988).

⁴⁶ For a detailed, opinionated review of ancient historians’ use of these modern theories see Wheeler 2011.

else in the *Iliad*.⁴⁷ The major exceptions are the policymakers, the Atreidae. They want to retrieve Helen; but as Achilles observes in Book 1 and again Book 9, the bulk of the Achaean army cares nothing for Helen. In fact, Homer suppresses the motivational role of the oath of Tyndareus, despite its importance in the epic cycle.

The gulf between the motives of the Atreidae and everyone else's motives forms the core of Achilles' angry outburst against Agamemnon in Book 1, precisely when Agamemnon anomalously opposes "your *hetairoi*" to "my *hetairoi*." But the evidence for combat motivation comes equally from two sources: on the one hand, all battle passages in which motivation is attributed; and on the other, the climactic sequence beginning with the death of Patroclus *hetairos* in Book 15 and ending with Hector's funeral in Book 24. *Hetaireia* dominates motivation in both the central epic plot and in the general narratives of war. In the *Iliad*, the greatest hero fights for his companion.

3. Prospective: *hetaireia* and military companionship after Homer

The *Odyssey* tells the story of how the world came from Troy—following Odysseus—to the social, political, and religious situation that projects the household into public space. The absence of warrior-companionship is essential to this projection. The military companionship of the *Iliad* fits poorly into both *oikos* and the product of synoicism, wherein the interdependence of individuals that comes from exchange and reciprocity does more work than mutuality—as not in battle; where morale is relocated to the relationship of the ruler (indifferently king, *aristoi*, *oligoi*, or the *demos* itself) with the gods (publicized especially by sacrifice); and where the

⁴⁷ The distinction between pre-battle and in-battle motivation is crucial but often ignored by Homeric scholars (van Wees 1996 is a notable exception). Modern work on combat motivation also fails to maintain this distinction consistently; for criticism in this vein see Newsome 2003, 41.

internal political and religious fire (transparently symbolized by the city hearth) is separated from the application of physical force as externalized in law (sometimes physically written, often attributed to but emphatically divided from the self-exiled lawgiver). Iliadic *hetaireia* must give way to the union of the domestic, the democratic, and the divine. The disappearance and replacement of *hetaireia* in the *Odyssey* constructs the thought-world of the *demos*, the phalanx, the tyrant, and the patron god.

But just as warrior-companionship yields to the *oikos*, so also the *heta(i)r-* root undergoes a profound semantic shift after Homer. If the *Iliad* shows the effects of *hetaireia* in battle, and the *Odyssey* shows humans unworthy of *hetaireia* and *hetairoi* unworthy of trust, Greek literature and law after Homer show *heta(i)r-* descending into severe disrepute. After epic, *hetairoi* are not warriors, and warriors are not *hetairoi*. Trust is no longer given to or earned by *hetairoi*, and *hetaireia* is often dangerous and immoral.⁴⁸

The semantic shift of *heta(i)r-* is clear from the nature of its referents. In archaic lyric, *hetairoi* are aristocratic companions, sometimes lovers, sometimes burial companions, occasionally female, often drinking buddies and far from reliably *pistoi*. In tragedy they are characters from Homer, Persians, Thebans, or an intoxicated Heracles. In comedy they drink, revel, conspire, and associate with the tyrant Hippias. In oratory they are often dangerously erotic, criminal, intoxicated, secretive, possibly conspiratorial or revolutionary. In historiography they are pre-democratic, on a level with or more influential than kin, and again conspiratorial or revolutionary. *Hetairai* are courtesans, and the *heta(i)r-* root appears only once in Athenian law: *hetairesis* is a crime of self-prostitution punished by a severe nine-year sentence.

⁴⁸ Political danger: Calhoun 1913, 10-39; religious danger: Burkert 1991.

The degeneration of *hetaireia* through the fifth century would be an interesting tale to tell, full of deep semantic, social-historical, and military-historical questions. Why are soldiers not called *hetairoi*?⁴⁹ Why are courtesans called *hetairai*? Why is *heta(i)r-* excluded from the laws of the Athenian *polis* – except for male self-prostitution?

If Iliadic *hetaireia* belongs in battle, post-Homeric *hetaireia* belongs in the symposium, begetting illicit love and aristocratic conspiracy.⁵⁰ But philosophy, too, flows from the wine of the symposium; and for philosophers both *hetaireia* and symposium come to mean something different still. The most striking fact about philosophical *hetaireia* is that it is apparently both invented and dominated by Socrates. He addresses others as *hetairos* more than anyone else in Greek literature.⁵¹ After Plato, philosophers' companions are regularly called *hetairoi*.⁵² Plutarch and Christian theologians use *heta(i)r-* to describe all kinds of intimate companionship. Socrates' *hetaireia* is often erotic, especially in the symposium, but only insofar as philosophical activity itself shares something with *eros*.⁵³ Plato's rehabilitation of philosophical *hetaireia* is a second tale not yet told. Athena's role in Platonic philosophy and her role as Mentor-*hetairos* seem tantalizingly linked, but the line from Homer to Socrates has not been drawn at the semantic depth offered in this dissertation.

⁴⁹ Xenophon refers to soldiers as *hetairoi* in two passages, but in both cases the soldiers are companions for some reason other than the fact that they are soldiers (*Anabasis* 4.7.11: Agias does not want his *hetairoi* to die during a particularly dangerous attack; 7.3.30: Xenophon offers himself and his *hetairoi* to the Thracian Seuthes).

⁵⁰ For the symposium as remnant of warrior initiation rites (rendered obsolete by the hoplite phalanx) see Murray 1983, 1983a, 1991; Bremmer 1990; Konstan 1997, 45-46.

⁵¹ Price 1989 discusses this statistic in the context of the Platonic corpus but touches only briefly on *hetaireia* outside of philosophical texts.

⁵² E.g. Pythagoras (Aristoxenus, Fragment 18, line 13), Plato (Aristotle, *Fragmenta varia*, category 1, treatise 2, fragment 28, line 23), Aristotle (Athenaeus 6.18.11; Galen, *De propriorum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione*, Kuhn 5.3.7). For philosophical "schools," not called *hetairiai*, see Jones 1999, 227-234.

⁵³ E.g. Reeve 2006; Sheffield 2006.

But *hetaireia* has a third history after epic. Homer calls warriors *hetairoi*; then he calls Athena *hetairos*. After centuries Socrates calls philosopher-companions *hetairoi*; and after another century Philip II of Macedon calls soldiers *hetairoi* again. The Iliadic resonances are probably deliberate under Philip, and surely so under his son Alexander. The nomenclatural ploy works: the Macedonian army displays extraordinary cohesion in combat, actively seeks the designation *hetairos*, and follows Alexander—in many ways a master of morale—to the ends of the earth. Royal *hetaireia* is confirmed with an oath to *Zeus Hetaireios*, mutually taken.⁵⁴ Alexander behaves like Iliadic hero: fighting with a band of *hetairoi*, risking his own tactical initiative to protect a fellow warrior in need,⁵⁵ saved from death by a warrior-companion.⁵⁶ Philip's rehabilitation of military *hetaireia* seems to stick: 'hetairoi' signifies warrior-companions in Byzantine military texts eight hundred years after Alexander's death. Hellenistic epic suggests another Alexandrian resonance: Apollonius' *Argonautica* calls Jason's companions *hetairoi*, as Herodotus does; and these *hetairoi*, too, follow their superb but not mythical leader to the ends of the earth.

The debasement and double revival of *hetaireia* after Homer is a three-part story whose first steps are suggested by the *Odyssey* itself. This dissertation builds the Homeric foundation for a five-century edifice spanning all genres, still to be written.

⁵⁴ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 8.572d.

⁵⁵ Arrian, *Anabasis* 3.15; Curtius, *Life of Alexander*, 3.11.13-16.

⁵⁶ Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.15.8; Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, 50.6.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: Combat motivation in the <i>Iliad</i>	302
TABLE 2: Actions of/to/for/with <i>hetairoi</i> in the <i>Iliad</i>	308
TABLE 3: Human leadership in the <i>Iliad</i>	314
TABLE 4: Words describing <i>hetairoi</i>	321
TABLE 5: Relative strength of warrior and <i>hetairos</i>	324

TABLE 1: Combat motivation in the *Iliad*

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
15	501	Ajax, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>aidos</i>
22	105	Hector, Trojans	<i>aidos</i>
15	660	Nestor	<i>aidos</i> for parents
9	239	Hector	battle rage (<i>lyssa</i>)
8	294-295	Teucer, Ajax, Agamemnon	battle-lust
7	210	Humans In General	battle-lust (θυμοβόρου ἔριδος)
7	152	Nestor	battle-lust (θυμὸς..πολεμίζειν)
11	445	Odysseus, Socus	boast (<i>eukhos</i>)
4	465-466	Elephenor, Ekhepolos	booty
4	532	Thoas, Peirous	booty
5	319-322	Sthenelos	booty
5	434-435	Diomedes	booty
5	617-618	Ajax, Amphios	booty
6	46-50	Adrestos, Menelaus	booty
9	318	Anyone	booty
10	480-481	Diomedes	booty
17	231-232	Hector, Lykians	booty
17	488	Hector, Aeneas, Alkimedon, Automedon	capture enemies
18	260	Polydamas	capture enemies
9	48-49	Diomedes, Sthenelos	capture Troy
6	512	Paris	character
17	327-328	Aeneas, Apollo	city
2	287-288	Hector, Achilles, Trojans	city
25	214-216	Hector, Hecuba	city
21	586-588	Agenor	city and family
24	729-730	Hector, Andromache	city and family
2	329	Odysseus, Achaeans	destruction
2	473	Athena, Achaeans	destruction
9	531	Aitolians	destruction
11	713	Moliones, Nestor, Neleus	destruction
15	701-702	Trojans	destruction
13	41-42	Trojans	destruction and booty
7	110	Menelaus, Agamemnon, Hector	<i>eris</i> (says Agamemnon)
13	365-367	Othruones	<i>eros</i> or just wife
16	725	Apollo-Asius, Hector	<i>eukhos</i>
5	576-577	Antilokhos, Menelaus	expedition
6	454-465	Hector, Andromache, Astyanax	family
8	57	Trojan Warriors, Their Wives and Children	family

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
8	330	Ajax, Teucer	family
9	340	Non-Atreidae	family
13	464	Aeneas, Deiphobus, Alkathoos	family
14	476	Akamas, Arkhelokhos, Promakhos	family
15	422	Hector, His Cousin Kaletor, Ajax	family
15	554	Hector, Melanippus, Dolops	family
15	660	Nestor, Argives	family
16	320	Maris, Atymnius, Antilokhos	family
16	755-756	Hector, Kebriones, Patroclus	family
17	223-224	Hector, Lykians	family
20	419-420	Hector, Polydorus	family
24	226-227	Priam, Hector, Achilles	family
12	243	Hector, Polydamas	fatherland
17	146-147	Glaukos, Hector, Sarpedon, Patroclus	fatherland
15	496-497	Hector, Trojans, Allies	fatherland and family
16	831-832	Hector, Patroclus	fatherland and family
4	431	Achaean, Commanders	fear of commanders
12	412	Lykians, Sarpedon	fear of commander's reproach
2	452	Athena, Agamemnon, Laos	fighting itself
4	222	Trojans	fighting itself
11	13-Nov	Eris, Achaeans	fighting itself
13	297	Meriones	fighting itself
13	337-338	All Warriors	fighting itself
1	161	Achilles	<i>geras</i>
10	213	Nestor, Achaeans	gift (<i>dosis</i>)
4	95	Pandaros	glory
7	91	Hector, Trojans, Achaeans	glory (<i>kleos</i>)
5	532	Atreidae, Danaans	glory (say Atreidae)
3	137	Menelaus, Paris, Helen	Helen
3	157	Trojan Elders, Trojans, Achaeans	Helen
3	254	Menelaus, Paris, Priam, Idaios	Helen
11	460-472	Odysseus, Menelaus, Ajax	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	585-595	Ajax, Eurypylos	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	456-460	Deiphobus, Aeneas, Idomeneus	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	477	Idomeneus, Askalaphos, Aphares, Deipuros, Meriones, Antilokhos	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	489	Aeneas, Deiphobos, Paris, Agenor	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	398	Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	363	Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	419	Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	491-501	Sarpedon, Glaukos	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	512	Teucer	<i>hetaireia</i>

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
16	532-533	Glaukos, Lykians	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	538	Glaukos, Sarpedon, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	548-550	Trojans, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	553	Hector, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
18	151-152	Achaeans, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
3	8-9	Achaeans	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	265	Idomeneus, Agamemnon	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	336-348	Kephallaneans, Odysseus, Agamemnon	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	373	Tydeus, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	467-469	Agenor, Elephenor	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	491-500	Odysseus, Leukos	<i>hetaireia</i>
4	532	<i>hetairoi</i> Of Peirous, Thoas	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	106-112	Sthenelos, Diomedes	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	171-240	Aeneas, Pandaros	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	297-298	Aeneas, Pandaros	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	469	Ares, Aeneas, Trojans	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	618-619	Trojans, Ajax, Amphios	<i>hetaireia</i>
5	663-664	<i>hetairoi</i> , Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
6	6	Ajax, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
8	96	Diomedes, Odysseus, Nestor	<i>hetaireia</i>
9	652	Achilles, Myrmidons	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	347	Diomedes, Odysseus, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	382	Paris, Diomedes	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	396	Odysseus, Diomedes, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	469	Menelaus, Ajax, Odysseus	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	509	Achaeans, Machaon	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	520	Kebriones, Trojans	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	575-577	Eurypylos, Ajax	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	581-583	Paris, Eurypylos, Apisaon	<i>hetaireia</i>
11	588-589	Eurypylos, Ajax	<i>hetaireia</i>
12	122-123	Achaeans, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
12	334	Menestheus, Sarpedon, Glaukos	<i>hetaireia</i>
12	368-359	Two Ajaxes	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	188-191	Ajax, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	202-203	Ajax, Imbrios, Amphimakhos	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	270	Meriones	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	384	Asios, Othryones	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	402-403	Deiphobus, Asios	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	419	Antilokhos, Hypsenor, Deiphobus	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	421-423	Mekisteus, Alastor, Hypsenor	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	426	Idomeneus, Achaeans	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	531	Meriones, Askalaphos, Deiphobus	<i>hetaireia</i>

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
13	81	Menelaus, Deipyros	<i>hetaireia</i>
13	601	Peisander, Helenus, Menelaus	<i>hetaireia</i>
14	424	Polydamas, Aeneas, Agenor, Sarpedon, Glaukos, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
14	458-459	Argives, Ajas, Polydamas	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	248-250	Ajax, Hector, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	395-398	Patroclus, Achaeans	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	435	Ajax, Lykophron, Teucer	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	453-454	Polydamas, Kleitos	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	524-525	Dolops, Kroismos, Meges	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	539-540	Menelaus, Meges	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	583-584	Hector, Melanippus, Antilokhos	<i>hetaireia</i>
15	733-741	Ajax, Danaans	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	23-24	Patroclus, Achilles, Achaeans	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	270-274	Patroclus, Myrmidons	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	363	Hector, Trojans	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	398	Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	419-420	Sarpedon, Lykian <i>hetairoi</i> , Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	498-500	Sarpedon, Glaukos	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	508-509	Glaukos, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	544-546	Glaukos, Hector, Trojans, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	548-550	Trojans, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	552-553	Hector, Trojans, Sarpedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	556	Two Ajaxes, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	581	Patroclus, Epeigeus <i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	585	Patroclus, Epeigeus <i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
16	599-600	Achaeans, Bathycles, Glaukos	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	1-3	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	120-121	Menelaus, Ajax, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	128	Ajax, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	138-139	Menelaus, Ajax, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	150-151	Glaukos, Hector, Sarpedon, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	273	Zeus, Patroclus' Corpse, Patroclus' <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	346-347	Lykomedes, Leokritos, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	352	Asteropaios, Apisaon	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	364-365	Danaans	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	421-422	Trojans	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	471-472	Automedon, Alkimedon, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	477-478	Alkimedon, Automedon, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	509-511	Alkimedon, Automedon, Ajax, Menelaus	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	532	Ajax, Menelaus, Automedon	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	538-539	Automedon, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
17	556-558	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	563-564	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	591	Hector, Podes, Apollo	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	615	Koeranos, Idomeneus	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	636	Ajax, Menelaus, Achaeans	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	665-666	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	694-697	Antilokhos, Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	706	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	717-718	Ajax, Menelaus, Meriones	<i>hetaireia</i>
18	114-114	Achilles, Patroclus, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
19	210	Achilles, Patroclus, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
20	29	Achilles, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
20	75-76	Achilles, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
21	27-28	Achilles, Patroclus, Twelve Trojan Kouroi	<i>hetaireia</i>
21	95-96	Achilles, Lykaon, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
21	100-102	Achilles, Lykaon, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
21	133-134	Achilles, Patroclus, Trojans	<i>hetaireia</i>
21	538	Trojans (In City and Retreating Into City)	<i>hetaireia</i>
22	271-272	Achilles, Hector, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i>
22	331-336	Achilles, Hector, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
22	380	Achilles, Achaeans, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i>
23	23	Achilles, Patroclus	<i>hetaireia</i>
17	381-382	Thrasymedes, Antilokhos, <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetaireia</i> (and situational awareness)
4	470	Trojans and Achaeans, Elephenor	<i>hetaireia</i> (unclear)
5	561	Menelaus, Krethon, Orsilochos	<i>hetaireia</i> (pity)
5	610	Ajax, Menesthes, Ankhialos, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i> (pity)
15	562	Ajax, Argives	<i>hetaireia</i> / mutual shaming
20	441-442	Achilles, Hector	<i>hetaireia</i> / rage to kill
17	240-242	Ajax, Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>hetaireia</i> and self-preservation
1	158-159	Achilles, Achaeans	honor
4	155-182	Agamemnon, Menelaus	honor
9	319	Anyone	honor
17	291	Hippochoos, Patroclus' Corpse, Hector, Trojans	<i>kharis</i> (unclear)
10	212	Nestor, Achaeans	<i>kleos</i>
12	317-321, 325	Sarpedon, Glaukos	<i>kleos</i>
15	564	Ajax, Argives	<i>kleos</i>
17	16	Euphorbus, Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>kleos</i>
17	231-232	Hector, Lykians	<i>kleos</i>
17	415	Achaeans	<i>kleos</i>
22	110	Hector	<i>kleos</i>

Book	Lines	Parties	Reason Type
22	304-305	Hector, Achilles	<i>kleos</i>
12	407	Sarpedon, Ajax, Teucer	<i>kudos</i>
17	286-287	Trojans, Patroclus' Corpse	<i>kudos</i>
18	293-294	Hector, Polydamas	<i>kudos</i>
22	207	Achilles, Hector	<i>kudos</i>
20	502	Achilles	<i>kudos</i> (maybe)
21	543	Achilles	<i>kudos</i> (maybe)
4	269-270	Idomeneus, Agamemnon, Achaeans	oath (broken)
2	286	Odysseus, Agamemnon, Achaeans	oath (taken)
10	321-323, 392	Dolon, Hector	payment
10	304	Trojans, Hector	payment (<i>misthos</i>)
4	208	Makhaon, Talthybius	protect
11	674	Nestor, Itymoneus	protect property
2	590	Menelaus	revenge
3	28	Menelaus, Paris	revenge
3	351	Menelaus	revenge
3	366	Menelaus	revenge
11	141	Agamemnon, Hippolochos and Peisander	revenge
11	250	Koon, Iphidamas, Agamemnon	revenge
11	431	Socus, Charops, Odysseus	revenge (family)
6	55-60	Adrestos, Agamemnon, Menelaus	revenge / αἵσιμα
15	733	Ajax	safety
4	240-249	Argives	shame
4	336-348	Kephallaneans, Odysseus, Agamemnon	shame
4	370-402	Diomedes, Agamemnon	shame
5	493	Hector, Sarpedon	shame
6	442	Hector, Andromache, Astyanax, Trojans	shame
11	409	Odysseus	shame
17	336	Aeneas, Trojan and Allied Commanders	shame (<i>aidos</i>)
11	314	Odysseus, Diomedes, Hector	shame (<i>elenkhos</i>)
11	317	Diomedes, Odysseus	shame (<i>elenkhos</i>)
5	800-813	Diomedes, Athena	shame (father)
7	161	Nestor, Achaeans	shame (<i>neik-</i>)
17	93-95	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	shame (<i>nemesis</i> and <i>aidos</i>)
17	254-255	Menelaus, Achaean Leaders	shame (<i>nemesis</i>)
17	556-558	Menelaus, Patroclus' Corpse	shame (<i>oneidos</i>)
15	657-658	Argives, Hector	shame and fear
11	556	Ajax, Kebriones, Hector	ships
15	700	Achaeans	survival
12	307	Sarpedon	<i>thumos</i> and Zeus
9	703	Diomedes, Achilles	<i>thumos</i> or god

TABLE 2: Actions of/to/for/with *hetairoi* in the *Iliad*

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
3	378	retrieve arms	<i>hetairoi</i>	Paris' helmet	Menelaus
3	32	protect	Paris	<i>hetairoi</i>	Paris
3	260	assist	<i>hetairoi</i>	Priam's horses	Priam
4	413	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Pandaros	Pandaros
4	154	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Menelaus	Menelaus
4	266-267	fight alongside	Idomeneus <i>hetairos</i>	Agamemnon	Agamemnon
4	373	fight alongside	Tydeus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
4	441	lead alongside	Eris Hetaira	Trojans and Achaeans	Ares
4	523	protect	Diores	<i>hetairoi</i>	
4	532	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Peirous	Peirous
5	165	gift	Diomedes	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
5	325	gift	Sthenelos	Deipulos <i>hetairos</i>	Deipulos <i>hetairos</i>
5	514	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Aeneas	<i>hetairoi</i> , Aeneas
5	574	protect (corpse)	Antilokhos, Menelaus	Krethon, Orsilokhos	Kreton, Orsilokhos, <i>hetairoi</i>
5	663-664	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Sarpdon	Sarpdon
5	692-693	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Sarpdon	Sarpdon
5	694-695	protect	Πελαγῶν <i>hetairos</i>	Sarpdon	Sarpdon
6	6	protect	Ajax	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
7	115	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Menelaus	Menelaus
8	332	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Teucer	Teucer
8	537	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Diomedes	Diomedes
9	2	terrify	Phuza Hetaira	Achaeans	
9	205	obey (<i>peith</i>)	Patroclus	Achilles	Achilles
9	220	sacrifice	Achilles	Patroclus	Achilles
9	585	persuade	<i>hetairoi</i>	Meleager	everyone who cares about Meleager
9	630	care (negated)	Achilles	love of <i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
9	658	offer hospitality	Patroclus	<i>hetairoi</i>	Phoenix
10	37	scout	Agamemnon	<i>hetairos</i>	Achaeans
10	84	seek	Agamemnon	<i>hetairos</i>	Agamemnon
10	151-152	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Diomedes	Diomedes
10	235	scout	<i>hetairos</i>	N/A	Diomedes and all Achaeans
10	242	scout	Diomedes	<i>hetairos</i>	Diomedes
10	355	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Dolon	Dolon
10	522	protect	Hippokoon	<i>hetairos</i> (Rhesus)	Rhesus

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
10	560	kill	Diomedes	Rhesus' <i>hetairoi</i>	Diomedes
11	91	fight alongside	Danaans	<i>hetairoi</i>	Danaans
11	93	kill	Agamemnon	Bianor and <i>hetairos</i>	Agamamenon
11	461	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Odysseus	Odysseus
11	585	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Eurypylos	Eurypylos
11	595	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Ajax	Ajax
11	602	scout	Patroclus	Machaon	Achilles
11	615	scout	Patroclus	Machaon	Achilles
12	49	exhort	Hector	<i>hetairoi</i>	Trojans
12	122-123	protect	Achaean	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
12	334	protect	Menestheus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
12	379	kill	Ajax	<i>hetairos</i>	Ajax
13	165	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Meriones	Meriones
13	210-212	protect	Idomeneus	<i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetairos</i>
13	213	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetairos</i>
13	249-253	support	Idomeneus	Meriones <i>hetairos</i>	Meriones
13	419	protect (corpse)	Antilokhos	Hypsenor	Hypsenor
13	421-423	protect (corpse)	Mekisteus and Alastor	Hypsenor	Hypsenor
13	456	fight alongside	Deiphobus	Aeneas	Deiphobus
13	477	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Idomeneus	Idomeneus
13	489	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Aeneas	Aeneas
13	566	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Askalaphos	Askalaphos
13	596	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Helenus	Helenus
13	640-641	gift	Menelaus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
13	648	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Harpalion	Harpalion
13	653-654	hold	<i>hetairoi</i>	Harpalion	Harpalion
13	709-710	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Ajax	Ajax
13	767	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Paris	Paris
13	778	gather	Hector	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector
13	780	die	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>	-
14	408	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
14	428-429	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
15	10-Sep	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
15	64	send into battle	Achilles	Patroclus	Achaean

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
15	240-241	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
15	249	kill	Hector	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector
15	330	kill	Hector	<i>hetairos</i>	Hector
15	404	persuade	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	Achilles	Achaean
15	434	kill	Hector	<i>hetairos</i> Lykophron	Hector
15	446	kill	Teucer	<i>hetairos</i> Kleitos	Achaean
15	501	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achaean
15	518-519	kill	Polydamas	Otus <i>hetairos</i>	Trojans
15	591	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Antilokhos	Antilokhos
15	650	fight alongside (negated)	<i>hetairoi</i>	Periphetes	nobody
15	651-652	fight alongside (negated)	<i>hetairoi</i>	Periphetes	nobody
15	671	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
16	170	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles	Myrmidons
16	204	keep from battle	Achilles	<i>hetairoi</i> (unwilling)	Achilles
16	240	protect	Achilles (via Zeus)	<i>hetairos</i> and <i>hetairoi</i>	Myrmidons
16	248	protect	Achilles (via Zeus)	Patroclus and <i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles and Myrmidons
16	268	fight alongside	Myrmidon <i>hetairoi</i>	Myrmidon <i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus and Myrmidon <i>hetairoi</i>
16	268	fight alongside	Myrmidon <i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	Patroclus and Myrmidon <i>hetairoi</i>
16	290-292	protect (negated)	<i>hetairoi</i> Paionians	Pyraechmes Hegemon	Patroclus
16	327	die	Antilokhos and Thrasymedes	brothers (<i>hetairoi</i> of Sarpedon)	Myrmidons
16	491	name while dying	Sarpedon	Glaukos	Sarpedon
16	512	protect	Teucer	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
16	524-525	rouse	Glaukos	<i>hetairoi</i>	Lykians
16	560-561	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Sarpedon's corpse	Sarpedon
16	581	avenge	Patroclus	Epeigeus <i>hetairos</i>	Epeigeus <i>hetairos</i>
16	663-665	gift	Patroclus	Sarpedon's armor	<i>hetairoi</i>
16	817	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	Patroclus
17	114	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Menelaus	Menelaus
17	117	fight alongside	<i>hetairoi</i>	Ajax	Achaean
17	129	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
17	150-151	avenge (negated)	Hector	Sarpedon <i>hetairos</i>	Sarpedon's corpse

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
17	189	follow	Hector	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
17	204	kill	Hector	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	Hector
17	273	protect (corpse)	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	Patroclus
17	344- 345	kill	Aeneas	Leiokritos <i>hetairos</i>	Aeneas
17	381- 382	monitor	Thrasymedes and Antilokhos	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achaean
17	410- 411	die	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	-
17	459	lament	Automedon	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	-
17	466	protect	Alkemedon	Automedon <i>hetairos</i>	Automedon
17	500	protect	Automedon	Alkimedon	Alkimedon
17	532	protect	Ajax and Menelaus	Automedon <i>hetairos</i>	Automedon
17	577	kill	Menelaus	Podes	Patroclus' corpse
17	581	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Menelaus	Menelaus
17	589	kill	Menelaus	Podes	Menelaus
17	636	protect	Ajax and Menelaus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
17	640	communicate	<i>hetairos</i>	Achilles	Achilles
17	641- 642	die	<i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetairos</i>	-
17	655	die	<i>hetairos</i>	<i>hetairos</i>	-
17	679- 680	look	Menelaus	Ethnos Hetairon	Menelaus
17	683	encourage and exhort	Antilokhos	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achaean
17	698- 699	drive chariot	Laodokos <i>hetairos</i>	Antilokhos	Antilokhos
17	702	protect (negated)	Menelaus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i> (negated)
18	80	die	Patroclus	Patroclus	-
18	80	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
18	81-82	honor	Achilles	Patroclus	Patroclus
18	98-99	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
18	102	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
18	102	protect (negated)	Patroclus	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
18	128- 129	lament	Anyone	<i>hetairoi</i>	-
18	233- 234	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	-
18	235- 236	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
18	251	protect	Polydamas <i>hetairos</i>	Trojans	Trojans

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
18	317	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
18	343	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	-
18	460	die	Patroclus	Patroclus	-
9	6-May	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	-
9	210	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
19	305	command	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles	Achilles
19	315	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
19	345	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
20	29	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
22	240	protect	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	Hector
22	390	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
22	492	beg	<i>hetairoi</i>	son of warrior (symbolically Aystanax)	-
23	5	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	-
23	6	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus	-
23	18	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	37	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	87	take counsel	Achilles and Patroclus	Achilles and Patroclus	Achilles and Patroclus
23	134	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Patroclus' corpse	-
23	137	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	152	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	178	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	224	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
23	252	lament	Achaean	Patroclus	-
23	512	gift	Sthenelos	<i>hetairoi</i>	<i>hetairoi</i>
23	556	rejoice	Achilles	Antilokhos <i>hetairos</i>	Antilokhos
23	563	gift	Automedon <i>hetairos</i>	Eumelos	Eumelos
23	612	gift	Menelaus	Noemon, <i>hetairos</i> of Antilokhos	Antilokhos
23	645	bury	Achilles	Patroclus	Patroclus
23	695- 696	support	<i>hetairoi</i>	Epeios	Epeios
23	753	honor	Achilles	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	Patroclus
23	848- 849	support	<i>hetairoi</i>	Polypoites	Polypoites
24	3-4	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
24	51	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
24	123- 124	support	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles	Achilles
24	334- 335	support	Hermes	any human	any human

Book	Line	Action Type	Agent	Patient	Beneficiary
24	473-474	support	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles	Achilles
24	590	carry with	<i>hetairoi</i>	Achilles	Hector's corpse
24	591	lament	Achilles	Patroclus	-
24	262	flay	<i>hetairoi</i>	sheep	Achilles
24	643-645	make bed	<i>hetairoi</i>	Beds	Priam and Herald
24	755	kill	Hector	Patroclus <i>hetairos</i>	Hector
24	792-794	lament	<i>hetairoi</i>	Hector	-

TABLE 3: Human leadership in the *Iliad*

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
1	273	no	no	πείθω
1	274	no	no	πείθω
1	274	no	no	πείθω
1	296	yes	no	πείθω
1	313	no	yes	ἄνωγα
1	325	no	yes	μῦθον ἔτελλε
1	345	no	yes	πείθω
2	28	no	no	κελεύω
2	50	no	yes	κελεύω
2	74	no	yes	κελεύω
2	94	no	no	ὀτρύνω
2	75	no	yes	ἐρητύω
2	97	no	yes	ἐρητύω
2	151	no	yes	keleo
2	164	no	no	ἐρητύω
2	166	no	yes	πείθω
2	180	no	no	ἐρητύω
2	189	no	yes	ἐρητύω
2	198-199	no	yes	ἐλαύνω
2	198-199	no	yes	ὀμοκλάω
2	364	yes	yes	πείθω
2	440	yes	yes	ἐγείρω
2	441	no	yes	πείθω
2	442	no	yes	κελεύω
2	451	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
2	451	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
2	476	yes	no	διακοσμέω
2	494	no	no	ἄρχω
2	512	no	no	ἄρχω
2	518	no	no	ἄρχω
2	527	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	540	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	252	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	254	yes	no	kosmeo
2	257	no	no	ἄγω
2	258	yes	no	histemi
2	563	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	567	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	576	no	no	ἄρχω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
2	586	no	no	ἄρχω
2	589	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
2	601	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	609	no	no	ἄρχω
2	618	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	622	no	no	ἄρχω
2	623	no	no	ἄρχω
2	627	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	631	no	no	ἄγω
2	636	no	no	ἄρχω
2	638	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	645	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	650	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	651	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	654	no	no	ἄγω
2	657	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	671	no	no	ἄγω
2	278	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	685	no	no	ἀρχός (noun)
2	687	yes	no	ἡγέομαι (negated)
2	698	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω (while alive)
2	704	no	no	κοσμέω
2	713	no	no	ἄρχω
2	718	no	no	ἄρχω (before left on Lemnos)
2	726	no	no	Κοσμέω
2	732	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	736	no	no	ἄρχω
2	740	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	745	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω (implied)
2	748	no	no	ἄγω
2	756	no	no	ἄρχω
2	805	yes	no	σημαίνω
2	805	yes	no	ἄρχω
2	806	yes	no	ἐξηγέομαι
2	806	yes	no	Κοσμέω
2	816	yes	no	ἡγεμονεύω
2	819	yes	no	ἄρχω
2	823	yes	no	ἄρχω (implied)
2	826	yes	no	ἄρχω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
2	830	yes	no	ἄρχω
2	832	no	yes	ἐάω
2	834	no	yes	πείθω
2	837	no	no	ἄρχω
2	840	no	no	ἄγω
2	842	no	no	ἄρχω
2	842	no	no	ἄρχω
2	844	no	no	ἄγω
2	846	no	no	ἀρχός (noun)
2	848	no	no	ἄγω
2	851	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	856	no	no	ἄρχω
2	858	no	no	ἄρχω
2	864	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	867	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	871	no	no	ἡγέομαι
2	876	no	no	ἄρχω
3	47	no	yes	ἀγείρω
3	77	yes	yes	ἀνείργω
3	81	yes	yes	αὔω
3	116	no	yes	πέμπω
3	119	no	yes	κελεύω
3	120	no	yes	πείθω
3	259	no	yes	κελεύω
3	260	no	yes	πείθω
4	104	no	yes	πείθω
4	192	no	yes	προσανδάω
4	193	no	yes	καλέω
4	198	no	yes	πείθω
4	204	no	yes	καλέω
4	229	no	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
4	233	yes	no	θαρσύνω
4	250	yes	no	κοιρανέω
4	254	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
4	268	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
4	286	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
4	286	yes	yes	κελεύω
4	287	yes	no	ἄνωγα
4	294	yes	yes	στέλλω
4	294	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
4	301	yes	no	ἐπιτέλλω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
4	301-302	yes	yes	ἄνωγα
4	310	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
4	322	yes	no	κελεύω
4	336	yes	no	νεικέω
4	359	yes	no	νεικέω
4	359	yes	no	κελεύω
4	368	yes	no	νεικέω
4	414	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
4	428-429	yes	no	κελεύω
4	439	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
4	439	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
4	507	yes	no	νεμεσάω
4	515	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
5	320	yes	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
5	482	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
5	491	yes	no	λίσσομαι
5	496	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
5	520	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
5	528	yes	no	κελεύω
5	784	yes	no	αὔω
5	807	yes	no	προκαλίζομαι
5	810	yes	no	κέλομαι
5	818	yes	no	ἐπιτέλλω
5	823	yes	yes	κελεύω
5	824	yes	no	κοιρανέω
6	66-71	yes	yes	κέλομαι
6	105	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
6	110	yes	no	κέλομαι
7	95	no	yes	νεικέω
8	172	yes	yes	κέλομαι
8	184	yes	yes	κέλομαι
8	227	yes	yes	αὔω
8	280	yes	yes	εἶπον
8	496	no	yes	μεταυδάω
8	525	no	no	ἀγορεύω
9	10	yes	yes	κελεύω
9	220	no	yes	ἄνωγα
9	658	no	yes	κελεύω
10	38	no	yes	ὀτρύνω
10	55	no	yes	ὀτρύνω
10	56	no	no	ἐπιτέλλω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
10	61	no	yes	κελεύω
10	67	no	no	ἐγείρω
10	108	no	no	ἐγείρω
10	111	no	no	καλέω
10	125	no	no	καλέω
10	130	no	no	ἐποτρύνω
10	130	no	no	ἄνωγα
10	171	no	no	καλέω
10	300	no	no	κυκλῆσκω
10	356	no	yes	ὀτρύνω
11	16	no	yes	ἄνωγα
11	47	no	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
11	65	no	no	κελεύω
11	91	yes	no	κέλομαι
11	154	yes	no	κελεύω
11	165	yes	no	κελεύω
11	189, 204	yes	yes	ἄνωγα
11	213	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
11	213	yes	no	ἐγείρω
11	275	yes	no	αὔω
11	285	yes	no	κέλομαι
11	291	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
11	294	yes	no	σεύω
11	312	yes	no	κέλομαι
11	765	no	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
12	49	yes	yes	λίσσομαι
12	50	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
12	84	yes	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
12	86-87	yes	yes	ἔπομαι
12	88	yes	no	ἅμ' ἴσαν
12	91	yes	no	ἔπομαι
12	93	yes	no	ἄρχω
12	98	yes	no	ἄρχω
12	101	yes	no	ἡγέομαι
12	142	yes	yes	ὄρνυμι
12	251	yes	yes	ἡγέομαι
12	265	yes	yes	κελευτιάω
12	266	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
12	277	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
12	330	yes	no	ἄγω
12	367	yes	no	ὀτρύνω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
12	408	yes	no	κέλομαι
12	442	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
13	44	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
13	94	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
13	149	yes	no	αὔω
13	155	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
13	230	yes	no	κελεύω
13	361	yes	no	κελεύω
13	480	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
13	767	yes	no	ἐποτρύνω
13	778	yes	yes	ἀγείρω
14	432	no	no	ὀτρύνω
14	379	no	no	κοσμέω
15	258	no	yes	ἐποτρύνω
15	270	no	yes	ὀτρύνω
15	306	yes	no	ἄρχω
15	346	yes	yes	κέλομαι
15	424	yes	yes	κέλομαι
15	475	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
15	485	yes	no	κέλομαι
15	501	yes	no	κέλομαι
15	545-546	yes	no	κελεύω
15	560	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
15	568	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
15	658	yes	no	ὁμοκλάω
15	660	yes	no	λίσσομαι
15	667	yes	no	ὀτρύνω
15	687	yes	no	κελεύω
15	717	yes	yes	κελεύω
15	732	yes	yes	κελεύω
16	145	no	yes	ἄνωγα
16	167	no	no	ὀτρύνω
16	172	no	no	ἀνάσσω
16	173	no	no	ἄρχω
16	179	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
16	1983	no	no	ἡγεμονεύω
16	196	no	no	ἄρχω
16	197	no	no	ἄρχω (implied)
16	210	no	no	ὀτρύνω
16	268	no	no	κέλομαι
16	275	no	no	ὀτρύνω

Book	Lines	Combat?	Specific Orders?	Verb
16	372	yes	no	κελεύω
16	421	yes	no	κέλομαι
16	495	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
16	532	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
16	552-553	yes	no	ἄρχω
16	553-554	yes	yes	ὄρνυμι
17	117	yes	no	θαρσύνω
17	117	yes	no	ἐποτρύνω
17	183	yes	yes	κέλομαι
17	215	yes	yes	ὀτρύνω
16	219	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
17	356	yes	yes	κελεύω
17	423	yes	no	ὄρνυμι
17	668	yes	yes	ἐπιτέλλω
17	683	yes	yes	θαρσύνω
17	683	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
18	343	no	yes	κέλομαι
19	41	no	no	ὄρνυμι
19	305	no	yes	λίσσομαι
19	309	no	yes	κέλομαι
20	353	yes	yes	κελεύω
20	364	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
20	365	yes	yes	κέλομαι
20	373	yes	yes	ἐποτρύνω
22	101	yes	no	κελεύω
23	39	no	yes	κελεύω
23	129	no	yes	κελεύω
23	564	no	yes	κελεύω
24	252	no	yes	κελεύω
24	643-645	no	yes	κελεύω

TABLE 4: Words describing *hetairoi*

Modifier	Poem	Book	Line
ἀμφί	Iliad	2	417
ἀμφί	Iliad	8	537
ἀμφί	Iliad	10	151
ἀμφί	Iliad	15	9
ἀμφί	Iliad	15	241
ἀμφί	Iliad	16	290
ἀμφί	Iliad	18	233
ἀμφί	Iliad	18	344
ἀμφί	Iliad	19	5
ἀμφί	Iliad	19	212
ἀμφί	Iliad	22	240
ἀμφί	Iliad	23	695
ἀμφί	Iliad	24	123
ἀμφί	Iliad	24	622
ἀμφί	Odyssey	3	32
ἀμφί	Odyssey	9	380
ἀμφί	Odyssey	9	492
ἀμφί	Odyssey	9	544
ἀμφί	Odyssey	11	520
ἄμφω	Iliad	4	523
ἄμφω	Iliad	13	549
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	3	378
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	4	266
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	8	332
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	13	421
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	16	363
ἐρίηρος	Iliad	23	6
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	9	100
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	9	172
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	9	193
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	9	555
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	10	387
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	10	405
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	10	408
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	10	471
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	12	199
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	12	397
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	14	249
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	17	428
ἐρίηρος	Odyssey	19	273

Modifier	Poem	Book	Line
ἐσθλός	Iliad	5	469
ἐσθλός	Iliad	13	709
ἐσθλός	Iliad	16	327
ἐσθλός	Iliad	17	345
ἐσθλός	Iliad	17	590
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	2	391
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	5	110
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	5	133
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	7	251
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	8	585
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	11	7
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	12	149
ἐσθλός	Odyssey	23	331
ὀλέξαντες	Odyssey	9	63
ὀλέξαντες	Odyssey	9	566
ὀλέξαντες	Odyssey	10	134
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	2	174
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	9	534
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	11	114
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	12	141
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	13	340
ὀλέξας	Odyssey	23	319
πιστός	Iliad	15	331
πιστός	Iliad	15	437
πιστός	Iliad	17	500
πιστός	Iliad	17	557
πιστός	Iliad	17	589
πιστός	Iliad	18	235
πιστός	Iliad	18	460
πιστός	Odyssey	15	539
φίλος	Iliad	4	523
φίλος	Iliad	5	695
φίλος	Iliad	9	630
φίλος	Iliad	10	522
φίλος	Iliad	13	549
φίλος	Iliad	16	270
φίλος	Iliad	16	491
φίλος	Iliad	17	462
φίλος	Iliad	17	577
φίλος	Iliad	17	636
φίλος	Iliad	18	80
φίλος	Iliad	18	233

Modifier	Poem	Book	Line
φίλος	Iliad	19	345
φίλος	Iliad	22	390
φίλος	Iliad	23	152
φίλος	Iliad	23	178
φίλος	Iliad	23	556
φίλος	Iliad	23	695
φίλος	Iliad	24	4
φίλος	Iliad	24	51
φίλος	Iliad	24	123
φίλος	Iliad	24	416
φίλος	Iliad	24	591
φίλος	Odyssey	9	63
φίλος	Odyssey	9	566
φίλος	Odyssey	10	134
φίλος	Odyssey	12	309
φίλος	Odyssey	22	208
ἀγγέμαχος	Iliad	16	248

TABLE 5: Relative strength of warrior and *hetairos*
(the stronger of the two is highlighted in grey)

warrior	<i>hetairos</i>
Achilles	Antilokhos
Achilles	Patroclus
Aeneas	Agenor
Aeneas	Deiphobus
Aeneas	Paris
Agamemnon	Idomeneus
Ajax	Lykophron
Antilokhos	Laodokos
Antilokhos	Noemon
Asteropaios	Apisaon
Automedon	Alkimedon
Bianor	Oileus
Eumelos	Automedon
Hector	Aeneas
Hector	Archeptolemos
Hector	Eniopes
Hector	Laodokos
Hector	Podes
Hector	Polydamas
Hector	Sarpedon
Hippokoon	Rhesos
Idomeneus	Antilokhos
Idomeneus	Aphares
Idomeneus	Askalaphos
Idomeneus	Leipuros
Idomeneus	Meriones
Lykomedes	Leokritos
Meges	Otus
Menestheus	Stikhios
Nestor	Alastor
Nestor	Biantos
Nestor	Haimon
Nestor	Khromion
Nestor	Pelagon
Odysseus	Leukos
Patroclus	Achilles
Poulydamas	Kleitios
Sarpedon	Atymnius
Sarpedon	Epikles
Sarpedon	Glaukos
Sarpedon	Maris
Sarpedon	Pelagon
Teucer	Lykophron

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, A. *Merit and Responsibility*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Adkins, A. "Homeric gods and the values of Homeric society." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 92 (1972): 1-19.
- Albracht, F. *Kampf und Kampfschilderung bei Homer*. Naumburg: Sieling, 1886, 1895.
- Alden, M.J. "The role of Telemachus in the Odyssey." *Hermes* 115, no. 2 (1987): 129-137.
- Allan, William. "Divine justice and cosmic order in early Greek epic." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126 (2006): 1-35.
- Allen-Hornblower, E. "Gods in Pain: Walking the Line Between Divine and Mortal in Iliad 5." *Lexis* 32 (2014): 27-57.
- Andrewes, A. "Phratries in Homer." *Hermes* (1961): 129-140.
- Annas, Julia. "Plato and Aristotle on friendship and altruism." *Mind* 86, no. 344 (New Series, 1977): 532-554.
- Apthorp, M.J. "The obstacles to Telemachus' return." *Classical Quarterly* 30, no. 01 (1980): 1-22.
- Arieti, J. "Achilles' inquiry about Machaon: the critical moment in the Iliad." *CJ* 79 (1983): 125-130.
- Armstrong, C. B. "The Casualty Lists in the Trojan War." *G&R* 16 (1969): 30-31.
- Arvidsson, Stefan. *Aryan Idols: Indo-European Mythology as Ideology and Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Austin, M. M. and Vidal-Naquet, P. *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Austin, Norman. "Telemachos Polymechnos." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* (1969): 45-63.
- Austin, Norman. "Name magic in the Odyssey." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5 (1972): 1-19.
- Austin, Norman. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Bakker, Egbert J. *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bartov, Omar. *Hitler's Army: Soldiers, Nazis, and War in the Third Reich*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bassett, S.E. "The proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey." *American Journal of Philology* 44 (1923): 339-348.

Beck, D. "Speech introduction and the character development of Telemachus." *Classical Journal* 94 (1998): 121-141.

Beck, D. *Homeric Conversation*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2005.

Beekes, Robert. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Bekker, Immanuel. "Über den Anfang der Odyssee." *Homerische Blätter* (1863): 99-107.

Benardete, S. "Achilles and the Iliad." *Hermes* 91 (1963): 1-16.

Benardete, S. *The Bow and the Lyre: A Platonic Reading of the Odyssey*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.

Benveniste, Émile. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Trans. Elizabeth Palmer. Miami: University of Miami Press, 1973.

Bershadsky, N. "The unbreakable shield: thematics of *sakos* and *aspis*." *Classical Philology* 105, no. 1 (2010): 1-24.

Bertman, Samuel. "A study of analogy and contrast as elements of symmetrical design in the structure of the *Odyssey*." PhD diss., Columbia University, 1965.

Bespaloff, Rachel. *On the Iliad*. Edited by Mary (trans.) McCarthy., bk. IX. Washington, DC: Pantheon Books, 1947.

Bethe, E. *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*. 2nd Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1929.

Beye, C. R. "Homeric battle narrative and catalogues." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964): 345-373.

Beye, C. R. *The Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Epic Tradition*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1966.

Biniek, K.L. "Aristotle on the Good of Friendship: Why the Beneficiary is Not What Matters." PhD diss., University of Western Ontario, 2013.

Bona, G. *Studi sull' Odissea*. Torino: Giappichelli, 1966.

- Bonifazi, A. "Inquiring into Nostos and its Cognates." *AJP* 130, no. 4 (Winter, 2009): 481-510.
- Bonifazi, A. *Homer's Versicolored Fabric: The Evocative Power of Ancient Greek Epic Word-Making*, bk. 50. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2012.
- Bonner, R.J. and Smith, G. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Bowden, H. "Hoplites and Homer: warfare, hero cult, and the ideology of the polis." In *War and Society in the Greek World*, edited by J. Rich and G. Shipley, 45-63. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Bowra, C. M. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- Bowra, C. M. *Homer*. New York: Scribner, 1972.
- Bremmer, J.N. "Adolescents, symposion, and pederasty." In *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, edited by O. Murray, 135-148. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- van Brock, Nadia. "Substitution rituelle." *Revue hittite et asianique* 65 (1959): 117-146.
- Brock, R. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Brugmann, Karl and Delbrück, Berthold. *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachchen*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1893.
- Burgess, Jonathan. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Burgess, J. "Problems with the vengeance theory." *American Journal of Philology* 118 (1997): 1-19.
- Burkert, W. "Zum Altgriechischen Mitleidsbegriff." PhD diss., Friedrich-Alexander-Universität, 1955.
- Burkert, W. "Von Amenophis II zur Bogenprobe des Odysseus." *Grazer Beiträge* 1 (1973): 69-78.
- Burkert, W. *Greek Religion*. Edited by trans. J. Raffan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Burkert, W. "Oriental symposia: contrasts and parallels." In *Dining in a Classical Context*, edited by W.J. Slater, 7-24. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Burkert, W. "The song of Ares and Aphrodite: on the relationship between the Odyssey and the Iliad." In *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*, edited by G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones,

249-262. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Busolt, Georg. *Griechische Staatskunde*. Munich: Beck, 1920.

Buxton, R.G.A. *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Cairns, D. L. *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Calhoun, G.M. "Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation." PhD diss., University of Texas, 1913.

Calhoun, G.M. "Zeus the father in Homer." *TAPA* 66 (1935): 1-17.

Carreras, Anthony. "Aristotle on other-selfhood and reciprocal shaping." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (October, 2012): 319-336.

Cartledge, Paul. "We are all Greeks? Ancient (especially Herodotean) and modern contestations of Hellenism." *BICS* 40 (1995): 75-82.

Catanzaro, Andrea. *Paradigmi politici nell'epica homerica*. Firenze: Centro editoriale toscano, 2008.

Cavalli, M. V. "The Homeric aristocratic oikos: a model of socio-economical aggregation." *Gaia: revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce Archaique*, no. 12 (2009): 69-76.

Chakravarty, Uma. "The Maruts." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72/73 (1991): 611-636.

Chalmers, D. *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Chomsky, N. *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Chomsky, N. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1986.

Cingano, Ettore. "A catalogue within a catalogue: Helen's suitors in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (fr. 196-204)." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by R. Hunter, 118-152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Clarke, H. W. "Fire imagery in the Odyssey." *Classical Journal* 57, no. 8 (May, 1962): 358-360.

Clarke, H. W. *The Art of the Odyssey*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1967.

- Clarke, W. M. "Achilles and Patroclus in love." *Hermes* 106, no. 3 (1978): 381-396.
- Clastres, P. "La desgracia del guerrero salvaje." In *Investigaciones en antropología política*, 217-256. Barcelona: Gedisa, 1988.
- Claus, D. B. "Aidos in the Language of Achilles." *TAPA* 105 (1975): 13-28.
- Clay, J. S. "Demas and Aude: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer." *Hermes* 102, no. 2 (1974): 129-136.
- Clay, J. S. "The beginning of the Odyssey." *American Journal of Philology* (1976): 313-326.
- Clay, J. S. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Clay, J. S. "The dais of death." *TAPA* 124 (1994): 35-40.
- Collins, Leslie. *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenaeum, 1988.
- Considine, Patrick. "The Indo-European origin of Greek *menis*, 'wrath'." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 83, no. 1 (November, 1985): 144-170.
- Cook, E. *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Cook, E. "Active and passive heroics in the *Odyssey*." *Classical World* 93, no. 2 (Nov.-Dec., 1999): 149-167.
- Cook, E. "Agamemnon's test of the army in *Iliad* book 2 and the function of Homeric *akhos*." *American Journal of Philology* 124, no. 2 (2003): 165-198.
- Cook, E. "Structure as interpretation in the Homeric *Odyssey*." In *Defining Greek Narrative*, edited by D. Cairns and R. Scodel, 75-100. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
- Cooley, C.H. *Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind*.: Scribner, 1909.
- Crissy, K. "Herakles, Odysseus, and the bow: *Odyssey* 21.11-41." *Classical Journal* 93, no. 1 (Oct.-Nov., 1997): 41-53.
- Crotty, Kevin. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Crowley, Jason. *The Psychology of the Athenian Hoplite*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Davies, David Tudor. *Nelson's Navy: English Fighting Ships, 1793-1815*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1996.

Davies, Malcolm. "The judgement of Paris and Iliad Book XXIV." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101 (1981): 56-62.

Davies, Malcolm. "The Date of the Epic Cycle." *Glotta* 67, no. 1/2 (1989): 89-100.

Delebecque, E. *Télémaque et la Structure de l'Odyssée*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, 1958.

Dennett, D.C. *Consciousness Explained*. London: Little, Brown, 1991.

Dentzer, J.-M. *Le Motif du banquet couche' dans la proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* Rome:, 1982.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. *Les ruses d'intelligence: la Metis des grecs*. Paris: Flammarion, 1974.

Dihle, Albrecht. *Homer-Probleme*. Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag, 1970.

Dimock, Jr., G. E. "The name of Odysseus." *Hudson Review* 9, no. 1 (Spring, 1956): 52-70.

Dimock, Jr., G. E. *The Unity of the Odyssey*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.

Dirlmeier, F. "PHILOS und PHILIA im vorhellenistischen Griechentum." PhD diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, 1931.

Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Doherty, L.E. "Athena and Penelope as foils for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 39, no. 3 (New Series, 1991): 31-44.

Doherty, L.E. "Sirens, Muses, and female narrators in the *Odyssey*." In *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, edited by B. Cohen, 81-92. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Donlan, W. "Change and shifts in the meaning of *demos* in the literature of the archaic period." *PP* 35 (1970): 381-395.

Donlan, W. "The tradition of anti-aristocratic thought in early Greek poetry." *Historia* 22 (1973): 145-154.

Donlan, W. "The structure of authority in the *Iliad*." *Arethusa* 12, no. 1 (1979): 51-70.

Donlan, W. "Reciprocities in Homer." *CW* 75 (1981): 137-175.

Donlan, W. “*Pistos philos hetairos*.” In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, edited by T. J. Figueira and G. Nagy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Donlan, W. “The pre-state community in Greece.” *SO* 64 (1989): 5-29.

Donlan, W. “The unequal exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in light of the Homeric gift-economy.” *Phoenix* 43, no. 1 (1989): 1-15.

Donlan, W. “Achilles the ally.” *Arethusa* 35, no. 1 (Winter, 2002): 155-172.

Dumézil, Georges. *The Destiny of the Warrior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Dunkle, Roger. “Swift-footed Achilles.” *Classical World* 90, no. 4 (1997): 227-234.

Duval, Nancy. “Le rôle de la Télémachie dans l’Odyssée d’Homère.” PhD diss., University of Montreal, 2011.

Edgeworth, R.J. and Mayrhofer, C.M. “The two Ajaxes and the two Krishnas.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 130, no. 2 (1987): 186-188.

Edmunds, S. T. *Homeric Nēpios*. PhD diss., Harvard University, 1976.

Edwards, A. T. “*Aristos Achaion*: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the Iliad.” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 17, no. 2 (1984): 61-80.

Edwards, A. T. “*Kleos aphthiton* and oral theory.” *Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988): 25-30.

Edwards, A. T. “Homer’s ethical geography: country and city in the *Odyssey*.” *TAPA* 123 (1993): 27-78.

Edwards, M. W. *Homer, Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

van Effenterre, H. “*Laos, laoi et lawagetas*.” *Kadmos* 16 (1977): 36-55.

Eisenberger, Herbert. *Studien zur Odyssee*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1973.

Elmer, D.F. *The Poetics of Consent Collective Decision Making and the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

Erbse, H. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Erbse, H. *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Fantuzzi, Marco. *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Fenik, Bernard. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*. Vol. 30. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1968.
- Finkelberg, M. "Is *kleos apthiton* a Homeric formula?" *Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986): 1-5.
- Finkelberg, M. "More on *kleos apthiton*." *Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (2007): 341-350.
- Finley, M. "Homer and Mycenae: property and tenure." *Historia* 6 (1957): 132-159.
- Finley, M. *The World of Odysseus*. New York: Viking Press, 1978.
- Finsler, S. "Das homerische Königtum." *N. Jahrbücher f.d. klass. Alt.* 9 (1906): 313-336.
- Floyd, E.D. "Kleos apthiton: an Indo-European perspective on early Greek poetry." *Glotta* 58, no. 3 (1980): 133-157.
- Focke, F. *Die Odyssee.*, bk. 17. Stuttgart-Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1943.
- Fodor, J.A. *The Language of Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Fodor, J.A. *The Modularity of Mind: An Essay on Faculty Psychology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.
- Ford, A. "Performing Interpretation: Early Allegorical Exegesis of Homer." In *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*, edited by Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus and Susanne Wofford, 33-53. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Frame, D. *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Frame, D. *Hippota Nestor*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2009.
- Fränkel, H. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921.
- Fränkel, H. *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*. Munich: Beck, 1962.
- Frege, Gottlob. "Über Sinn und Bedeutung." In *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 25-50. Vol. 100., bk. 1. Leipzig: Pfeffer, 1892.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. Trans. James Strachey. London: International Psycho-analytical Press, 1922.
- Friedrich, P. "Proto-Indo-European Kinship." *Ethnology* 5, no. 1 (January, 1966): 1-36.
- Friedrich, P. and Redfield, J. "Speech as a personality symbol: the case of Achilles." *Language* 54, no. 2 (June, 1978): 263-288.

- Friedrich, R. "Thrinakia and Zeus' ways to men in the *Odyssey*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 28, no. 4 (1987): 375-400.
- Friedrich, R. "Zeus and the Phaeacians: *Odyssey* 13.158." *American Journal of Philology* 110, no. 3 (1989): 395-399.
- Friedrich, R. "The hybris of Odysseus." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111 (1991): 16-28.
- Friedrich, W.-H. *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Frisk, H. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960.
- Fritz, S. G. "'We are Trying .. to Change the Face of the World' – Ideology and Motivation in the Wehrmacht on the Eastern Front: The View from Below." *The Journal of Military History* 6, no. 4 (October, 1996): 683-710.
- Frölich, F.H. *Die Militärmedizin Homer's*. Stuttgart: Enke, 1879.
- Gaisser, J.H. "A structural analysis of the digressions in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 73 (1969): 1-43.
- Galinsky, K. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
- Garlan, Yvon. *War in the Ancient World: A Social History*. Trans. J. Lloyd. London: Chatto & Windus, 1975.
- Garland, R. "The causation of death in the *Iliad*." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28 (1981): 43-60.
- Gates, H.P. *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Gauthier, P. "Notes sur l'étranger et l'hospitalité en Grèce et à Rome." *Ancient Society*, no. 4 (1973): 1-22.
- Gerber, D. E. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Germain, Gabriel. *Genèse de l'Odyssée*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.
- Gill, Christopher. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Glötz, G. *La solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce*. Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1904.
- Glötz, G. *La cité Grecque*. Paris: Renaissance du Livre, 1908.

Gottesman, A. "The Authority of Telemachus." *Classical Antiquity* 33, no. 1 (April, 2014): 31-60.

Gottschall, Jonathan. *The Rape of Troy: Evolution, Violence, and the World of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Gould, John. "Hiketeia." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1973): 74-103.

Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*. London: Duckworth, 2005.

Greenalgh, P. A. L. "The Homeric *therapon* and *opaon* and their historical implications." *BICS* 29 (1982): 69-80.

Greene, W.C. *Moirai: Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944.

Gresseth, G.K. "The Homeric sirens." *TAPA* 101 (1970): 203-218.

Griffin, J. "Homeric *pathos* and objectivity." *Classical Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (1976): 161-187.

Griffin, J. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

van Groningen, B.A. "The proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey." *Mededeelingen de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Weenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde N.R.* 9, no. 8 (1946): 279-294.

Grossman, D. *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. New York: Back Bay Books, 1996.

Guarducci, Margherita. *L'istituzione della fratria nella Grecia antica e nelle colonie greche d'Italia*. La Classe, 1937.

Hahn, E. Adelaide. "The supposed reflexive pronoun in Latin." *TAPA* 94 (1963): 86-112.

Hainsworth, J. B. "Good and Bad Formulae." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, edited by B. Fenik, 41-50. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Hall, Jonathan. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Haller, Benjamin S. "Dolios in *Odyssey* 4 and 24: Penelope's plotting and alternative narratives of Odysseus' *nostos*." *TAPA* 143, no. 2 (2013): 263-292.

Halverson, J. "Social order in the *Odyssey*." *Hermes* 113, no. 2 (2nd Quarter, 1985): 129-145.

Halverson, J. "The succession issue in the *Odyssey*." *Greece and Rome* 33, no. 2 (1986): 119-

Hammer, D. ““Who shall readily obey?”: authority and politics in the *Iliad*.” *Phoenix* 51, no. 1 (Spring, 1997): 1-24.

Hankey, R. “Evil in the Odyssey.” In *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, edited by E. M. Craik, 87-95. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Hanson, V. D. *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece*. Oakland: University of California Press, 1983.

Hanson, V. D. “Hoplite technology in phalanx battle.” In *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, 63-84. London: Routledge, 1991.

Harris, W. V. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Haubold, Johannes. *Homer’s People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Havelock, E. *The Greek Concept of Justice: From its Shadow in Homer to its Substance in Plato*.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Heath, John. “Telemachus *pepnugmenos*: growing into an epithet.” *Mnemosyne* 54, no. 2 (April, 2001): 129-157.

Hellmann, O. *Die Schlachtszenen der Ilias. Das Bild des Dichters vom Kampf in der Heroenzeit*., bk. 83. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000.

Henderson, W. D. *Why the Vietcong Fought: A Study of Motivation and Control in a Modern Army in Combay*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979.

Henderson, W. D. *Cohesion: The Human Element in Combat*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1985.

Herman, G. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Hermann, U. *Anthropos Deinos: Zur Rolle der Gewalt in der griechischen Archaik im Spiegel der epischen und lyrischen Dichtung*.: Verlag, 2014.

Hettrich, Heinrich. “Indo-European Kinship Terminology in Linguistics and Anthropology.” *Anthropological Linguistics* 27, no. 4 (Winter, 1985): 453-480.

Heubeck, A. “Zwei homerische peirai.” *ZA* (1981).

- Hignett, Charles. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Hitch, Sarah. *King of Sacrifice: Ritual and Royal Authority in the Iliad.*, bk. 25. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2009.
- Höfler, Otto. *Kultische Geheimbünde der Germanen*. Frankfurt am Main: Mortiz Diesterweg, 1934.
- Hofmeister, T.P. "Rest in Violence: Composition and Characterization in Iliad 16.155-277." *Classical Antiquity* 14, no. 2 (1995): 289-316.
- Hogan, J.C. "The temptation of Odysseus." *TAPA* 106 (1976): 187-210.
- Hölscher, U. *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee.*, bk. 6. Berlin: Wiedmann, 1939.
- Hölscher, U. "Die Atridensage in der Odyssee." In *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn*, 1-16. Köln: Böhlau, 1967.
- Hooker, J. "Homeric *Philos*." *Glotta* 65 (1987): 44-65.
- Hooker, J. "Homer, Patroclus, and Achilles." *Symbolae Osloenses* 64, no. 1 (1989): 30-35.
- Hopman, Marianne. "Narrative and rhetoric in Odysseus' tales to the Phaeacians." *American Journal of Philology* 133, no. 1 (2012): 1-30.
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T.W. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Edited by G.S. Noerr. Santa Clara: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Hummel, P. "*Philos/pistos*: etude d'un cas de complementarite metrique." *Informations Grammaticales* 36 (1988): 17-19.
- Irwin, Terence. "The metaphysical and psychological basis of Aristotle's ethics." In *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, edited by A. Rorty, 35-53., bk. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Jaeger, W. "Solons Eunomie." *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* XI (1926): 69-85.
- Janko, Richard. *The Iliad: A Commentary, vol 4: Books 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Janowitz, M. *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- de Jáuregi, M.H. "Priam's catabasis: traces of the epic journey to Hades in Iliad 24." *TAPA* 141, no. 1 (Spring, 2011): 37-68.

Jeanmaire, Henri. *Couroi et Courètes.*, bk. 21. Lille: Arno Press, 1939.

Jones, E. and Wessely, S. "Psychiatric casualties of war: an inter- and intra-war comparison." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 178 (2001): 242-247.

Jones, Nicholas F. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Jones, P.V. "The kleos of Telemachus: Odyssey 1.95." *American Journal of Philology* 109, no. 4 (Winter, 1988): 496-506.

de Jong, I. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

de Jong, I. "Between word and deed." In *Homer's Odyssey*, edited by L. Doherty, 62-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Julien, Alfredo. "O público e o privado nas assembleias de Ítaca." *Romanitas - Revista de Estudos Grecolatinos*, no. 2 (2013): 58-75.

Kahn, C. "Aristotle and altruism." *Mind* 90, no. 357 (1981): 20-40.

Kakridis, J. T. *Homeric Researches*. Vol. XLV. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1949.

Kakridis, J. T. *La notion de l'amitié et de l'hospitalité chez Homère*. Thessaloniki, 1963.

Kalinka, E. "Agamemnon in der Ilias." *SAWW* 221, no. 4 (1943).

Kearns, E. "The gods in the Homeric epics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, 59-73. : Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kellett, Anthony. *Combat Motivation: the Behavior of Soldiers in Battle*. Leiden: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1982.

Kim, Jinyo. *The Pity of Achilles: Oral Style and the Unity of the Iliad*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.

King, Anthony. *The Combat Soldier: Infantry Tactics and Cohesion in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Kirchhoff, A. *Die Homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*. Berlin: Hertz, 1859.

Kirk, G. S. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Kirk, G. S. "War and the warrior in the Homeric poems." In *Problèmes de la Guerre en Grèce*

- Ancienne*, edited by J.-P. Vernant. Paris: La Haye, 1968.
- Kirk, G. S. "The Formal Duels in Books 3 and 7 of the *Iliad*." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, edited by Bernard Fenik, 18-40. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Kirk, G. S. *A Commentary to Homer's Iliad, I-IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Knox, R. and Russo, J. "Agamemnon's test: *Iliad* 2.73-75." *Classical Antiquity* (1989): 351-358.
- Konstan, D. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Konstan, D. "To *hellenikon ethnos*: ethnicity and the construction of ancient Greek identity." In *Ethnos and ethnicity in early Greece*, edited by I. Malkin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Konstan, D. "Aristotle on anger and the emotions: the strategies of status." In *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, edited by S. Braund and G.W. Most, 99-120. : Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Kozak, Lynn. "Character and context in the rebuke exchange of *Iliad* 17.142-184." *Classical World* 106, no. 1 (Fall, 2012): 1-14.
- Kraut, Richard. *Aristotle on the Human Good*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Krischer, Tilman. *Formale Konventionen der Homerischen Epik*. Munich: Beck, 1971.
- Kullanda, Sergey. "Indo-European "Kinship Terms" Revisited." *Current Anthropology* 43, no. 1 (February, 2002): 89-111.
- Kullmann, W. "Die Probe des Achaierheeres in der *Ilias*." *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955).
- Kullmann, W. "God and Men in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 89 (1985): 1-23.
- Lacey, W.K. *The Family in Classical Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.
- Lamml, F. "*Ilias* B: Meuterei oder Versuchung." *Museum Helveticum* 5 (1948).
- Lang, Andrew. *The World of Homer*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910.
- Latacz, Joachim. *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*. Vol. 66. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1977.
- Lateiner, D. "The suitors' take: manners and power in Ithaca." *Colby Quarterly* 29 (1993): 172-196.

- Lattimore, R. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Laumann, W. *Die Gerechtigkeit der Götter in der Odyssee, bei Hesiod und bei den Lyrikern*. Zurich: Rheinfelder, 1988.
- Lehmann, Winfred. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974.
- Leimbach, R. "Rez. Latacz: Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios." *Gnomon* 52 (1980): 418-425.
- Leinieks, Valdis. "A structural pattern in the Iliad." *Classical Journal* (1973): 102-107.
- Lenneberg, E.H. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Lesky, A. *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos.*, bk. 4. Heidelberg: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1961.
- Levine, D.V. "Homeric laughter and the unsmiling suitors." *Classical Journal* 78, no. 2 (Dec. 1982 - Jan. 1983, 1982-1983): 97-104.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle: A Study in the Ecology of Religions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Lohmann, Dieter. *Der Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Loney, A. "Narrative Revenge and the Poetics of Justice in the Odyssey: A Study on Tisis." PhD diss., Duke University, 2010.
- Long, A.A. "Morals and values in Homer." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 90 (1970): 121-139.
- Lord, Albert B. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Louden, B. "Categories of Homeric wordplay." *TAPA* 125 (1995): 27-46.
- Louden, B. *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration, and Meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Lowenstam, Steven. *The Death of Patroclus: A Study in Typology*. Königstein: Hain, 1981.
- Lu, Katherine Elizabeth. "Heracles and the Heroic Disaster." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2013.
- Luce, J.V. "The 'polis' in Homer and Hesiod." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 78

(1978): 1-15.

Lukács, Georg. *Probleme des Realismus*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1955.

Mackie, Hilary Susan. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996.

MacLachlan, Bonnie. *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Maddoli, G. "Damos e basilees. Contributo allo studio delle origini della polis." *SMEA* 12 (1970): 7-57.

Marks, J. *Zeus in the Odyssey*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2008.

Marrou, H.-I. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. Paris: Seuil, 1948.

Marshall, S.L.A. *Men Against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command in Future War*. New York: William Morrow, 1947.

Martin, R. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Martin, R. "Telemachus and the last hero song." *Colby Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (September, 1993): 222-240.

McCarthy, B. "Sarcasm in the Iliad." *The Classical Weekly* (1943): 215-216.

McGlew, J. F. "Royal power and the Achaean assembly at Iliad 2.84-393." *Classical Antiquity* 8, no. 2 (October, 1989): 283-295.

McInerney, Jeremy. "Ethnos and ethnicity in early Greece." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by I. Malkin, 51-73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

McKerlie, Dennis. "Friendship, self-love, and concern for others in Aristotle's ethics." *Ancient Philosophy* 11 (1991): 85-101.

Merkelbach, R. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. 2nd Munich: Beck, 1951.

Messing, G.M. "On weighing Achilles' winged words." *Language* 57, no. 4 (December, 1981): 888-900.

Meyer, D. "Greek Pronouns in *sf*- and the PIE Personal Pronominal System." *Historische Sprachforschung* 110, no. 1 (1997): 93-108.

Mezger, Fritz. "IE *se*-, *swe*-, and derivatives." *Word* 4 (1948): 98-105.

- Miller, C. M. H. and Carmichael, J. W. S. "The growth of Telemachos." *Greece and Rome* 2nd Series, no. 1 (1954): 58-64.
- Miller, M. "Greek Kinship Terminology." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 73 (1953): 46-52.
- Minchin, E. "Homer springs a surprise: Eumaios' tale at Odyssey o.403-484." *Hermes* 120, no. 3 (1992): 259-266.
- Minchin, E. "Scripts and themes: cognitive research and the Homeric epic." *ClAnt* 11, no. 2 (1992): 229.
- Minton, W.M. "Homer's invocations of the Muses: traditional patterns." *TAPA* 91 (1960): 292-309.
- Mireaux, Emile. *La vie quotidienne au temps d'Homere*. Paris: Libraire Hachette, 1954.
- Mondi, R. "Skeptouchoi basileis: an argument for divine kings in early Greece." *Arethusa* 13, no. 2 (Fall, 1980): 203-216.
- Montes Miralles, Yolanda. *Ideologia aristocratica en los origenes del Arcaismo griego: Estrategias de alteridad en la Iliada.*, bk. 1487.: Archaeopress, 2006.
- Moran, Charles Wilson. *The Anatomy of Courage*. London: Constable, 1945.
- Morris, I. M. *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Morrison, J.V. "Homeric darkness: pattern and manipulation of death scenes in the *Iliad*." *Hermes* 127, no. 2 (2nd Qtr., 1999): 129-144.
- Most, G.W. "Anger and pity in Homer's *Iliad*." In *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, edited by S. Braund and G.W. Most, 50-75. : Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Moulton, C. "The end of the Odyssey." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53 (1974): 153-169.
- Moulton, C. "The speech of Glaukos in *Iliad* 17." *Hermes* 109, no. 1 (1981): 1-8.
- Mueller, M. "Knowledge and delusion in the *Iliad*." In *Essays on the Iliad: Selected Modern Criticism*, edited by J. Wright, 105-123. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Mueller, M. *The Iliad*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1984.
- Muellner, L. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Murnaghan, S. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Murnaghan, S. "The Plan of Athena." In *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, edited by B. Cohen. : Oxford University Press, 1995.

Murnaghan, S. "The trials of Telemachus: who was the Odyssey meant for?." *Arethusa* 35, no. 1 (2002): 133-153.

Murray, Gilbert. *The Rise of Greek Epic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Murray, O. "The Greek symposion in history." In *Tria corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, edited by E. Gabba, 257-272. : Como, 1983.

Murray, O. "The symposion as social organization." In *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation*, edited by R. Hägg, 195-199. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet in Athen, 1983.

Murray, O. "War and the symposium." In *Dining in a Classical Context*, edited by W.J. Slater, 83-103. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Myres, J. L. "The pattern of the Odyssey." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 72 (1952): 1-19.

Naas, Michael. *Turning: From Persuasion to Philosophy: A Reading of Homer's Iliad*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1995.

Nagler, Michael N. "Odysseus: the proem and the problem." *Classical Antiquity* 9, no. 2 (October, 1990): 335-356.

Nagy, G. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Nagy, G. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Nagy, G. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Naiden, F. "The invention of the officer corps." *Journal of the Historical Society* 7, no. 1 (March, 2007): 35-60.

Nappi, Maria Piera. "Note sull'uso di αἶαντε nell'Iliade." *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 44, no. 2 (July-December, 2002): 211-235.

Neal, Tamara. *The Wounded Hero: Non-fatal Injury in Homer's Iliad*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

- Nelsen, John T. "Auftragstaktik: A Case for Decentralized Battle." *Parameters* 17 (1987): 21-34.
- Newsome, Bruce. "The myth of intrinsic combat motivation." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 26 (2003): 24-46.
- Newton, R.M. "Odysseus and Hephaestus in the Odyssey." *Classical Journal* 83, no. 1 (Oct.-Nov., 1987): 12-20.
- Nickel, Roberto. "Euphorbus and the Death of Achilles." *Phoenix* 56, no. 3/4 (Autumn-Winter, 2002): 215-233.
- Nilsson, M. "Die Anfänge der Göttin Athene." *Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* IV, no. 7 (1921): 3-20.
- Nilsson, M. "Götter und Psychologie bei Homer." *ARW* 22 (1923): 366-377.
- Nilsson, M. *Homer and Mycenae*. London: Methuen & Co., 1933.
- van Nortwick, T. *Somewhere I Have Never Travelled: The Second Self and the Hero's Journey in Ancient Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- van Nortwick, T. "Like a woman: Hector and the boundaries of masculinity." *Arethusa* 34, no. 2 (2001): 221-235.
- O'Hara, J.J. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Olson, S. Douglas. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Osinga, Frans P. B. *Science, Strategy, and War: The Strategic Theory of John Boyd*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Page, D. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Page, D. *History and the Homeric Iliad.*, bk. 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Palmer, L. R. *Myceneans and Minoans: Aegean Prehistory in the Light of the Linear B Tablets*. New York: Alfred E. Knopf, 1962.
- Parry, A. "The language of Achilles." *TAPA* 87 (1956): 1-7.
- Parry, A. "Have we Homer's Iliad?" *YCS* 20 (1966): 175-216.
- Parry, M. *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère*. Paris, 1928.

- Paton, W.R. "Book VIII of the Odyssey." *The Classical Review* 26, no. 7 (1912): 215-216.
- Pedrick, Victoria. "The Muse corrects: the opening of the Odyssey." *Yale Classical Studies* 29 (1992): 39-62.
- Peradotto, John. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Perkell, C. "Reading the laments of Iliad 24." In *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*, 93-117. : Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Petit, D. **sue en grec ancien: la famille du pronom réfléchi. Linguistique grecque et comparaison indo-européenne*. Leuven: Peters, 1999.
- Petit, D. "Linguistique comparative et variation typologique: le cas du réfléchi dans les langues indo-européens." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 106 (2001): 16-29.
- Pinsent, J. "Ἠταῖρος/ἦταρον in the Iliad." In *Mélanges Édouard Delebecque*, 311-318. : Université de Provence, 1983.
- Pound, Ezra. *ABC of Reading*. London: Routledge, 1934.
- Price, A. W. *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Price, A. W. *Mental Conflict*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Pritchett, W.K. *The Greek State at War, Part IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Pucci, P. "The song of the Sirens." *Arethusa* 12, no. 2 (1979): 121-132.
- Pucci, P. "The proem of the Odyssey." *Arethusa* 15, no. 1 (Spring, 1982): 39-62.
- Pucci, P. *Odysseus Polytropos Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Pucci, P. "Antiphonal laments between Achilles and Briseis." *Colby Quarterly* 29 (1993): 253-272.
- Pucci, P. *The Song of the Sirens and Other Essays*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.
- Puddu, Nicoletta. "Reconstructing reflexive markers in Indo-European: evidence from Greek and Latin." En *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, editado por McCullagh M. Nielsen B. Ruppel A. George, C. and O. Tribulato, 89-100. Vol. 32. Cambridge:, 2007.
- Purves, Alex. *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Qviller, B. "The dynamics of the Homeric society." *SO* 56 (1981): 109-155.
- Raaflaub, K. "Soldiers, citizens and the evolution of the early Greek polis." In *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edited by L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, 79-96. : Routledge, 1997.
- Raaflaub, Kurt. "Homeric warriors and battles: trying to resolve old problems." *CW* 101 (2008): 469-483.
- Raaflaub, K. "Riding on Homer's chariot: the search for a historical 'epic society'." *Antichthon* 45 (2011): 1-34.
- Race, W.H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Race, W.H. "How Greek poems begin." *Yale Classical Studies* 29 (1992): 13-38.
- Race, W.H. "First appearances in the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 123 (1993): 79-107.
- Race, W.H. "Phaeacian Therapy in Homer's *Odyssey*." In *Combat Trauma and the Ancient Greeks*, edited by Peter Meineck and David Konstan. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Ready, J. L. "Why Odysseus strings his bow." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 50 (2010): 133-157.
- Redfield, J. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Reeve, C.D.C. "Plato on eros and friendship." In *A Companion to Plato*, edited by Hugh H. Benson, 204-307. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006.
- Reeve, M.D. "The language of Achilles." *Classical Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (November, 1973): 193-195.
- Reinhardt, K. *Werken und Formen*. Godesburg: Küpper, 1948.
- Reinhardt, K. "Tradition und Geist im Homerischen Epos." In *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*, edited by K. Reinhardt and C. Becker, 5-15. Göttingen: Becker, 1960.
- Reinhardt, K. *Der Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1961.
- Reinhardt, K. "The adventures in the *Odyssey*." In *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*, edited by S. Schein, 63-162. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

- Renaud, J.-M. "L'initiation de Télémaque dans l'Odyssée." In *La mythologie et l'Odyssée: Hommage à Gabriel Germain. Actes du colloque international de Grenoble 20-22 mai 1999*, edited by A. Hurst and F. Létoublon, 273-286. Geneva: Droz, 2002.
- Richter, W. *Die Landwirtschaft in Homerischen Zeitalter.*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- Rihll, T. "The power of the Homeric basileis." In *Homer 1987: Papers of the Third Greenbank Colloquium*, edited by J. Pinsent and H.V. Hurt, 39-50., bk. 2. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly, 1987.
- Rijksbaron, A. "Why is the incident on Thrinacia mentioned in Odyssey 1.7-9?." *Mnemosyne* 46, no. 4 (1993): 528-529.
- Robert, C. *Die griechische Heldensage I-II*. 4th Berlin: Weidmann, 1920.
- Robinson, D. "Homeric Philos: Love of Life and Limbs, and Friendship with One's Thymos." In *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, edited by E. M. Craik. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Roisman, H. M. "Pistos hetairos in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *Acta Classica* 26 (1983): 15-22.
- Roisman, H. M. "Eumaios and Odysseus – covert recognition and self-revelation?" *Illinois Classical Studies* 15, no. 2 (1990): 215-238.
- Roisman, H. M. "Like father like son: Telemachus' ΚΕΡΔΕΑ." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 137, no. 1 (1994): 1-22.
- Rose, G. "The quest of Telemachus." *TAPA* 98 (1967): 391-398.
- Rose, G. "The unfriendly Phaeacians." *TAPA* 100 (1969): 387-406.
- Rose, G. "The swineherd and the beggar." *Phoenix* 34, no. 4 (Winter, 1980): 285-297.
- Rose, P. W. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Rose, P. W. "Ideology in the *Iliad*: polis, basileus, theoi." *Arethusa* 30, no. 2 (1997): 151-199.
- Ross, S.A. "Barbarophonos: language and panhellenism in the *Iliad*." *Classical Philology* 100, no. 4 (October, 2005): 299-316.
- Russo, Joseph and Simon, Bennett. "Homeric psychology and the oral epic tradition." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29 (1968): 483-498.
- Rüter, Klaus. *Odyseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Rutherford, R. "At home and abroad: aspects of the structure of the *Odyssey*." *Cambridge Classical Journal* 31 (January, 1985): 133-150.

Rutherford, R. "The philosophy of the *Odyssey*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 145-162.

Rutherford, R. "The philosophy of the *Odyssey*." In *Homer's Odyssey*, edited by L.E. Doherty. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Saïd, S. "Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'*Odyssee*." *Etudes de littérature ancienne* (1979): 9-49.

Sammons, Benjamin. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Saraçoğlu, Ash. "Hero concept in the light of Homer's *Iliad* and the death of Sarpedon." *Anatolia* 29 (2005): 57-79.

Sarischoulis, E. *Motive und Handlung bei Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2009.

Schadewaldt, W. "De Prolog der *Odyssee*." *HSCP* 63 (1958): 15-32.

Schadewaldt, W. *Die Odyssee*. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1958.

Schadewaldt, W. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag, 1959.

Scheid-Tissinier, E. "Télémaque et les prétendants." *Acta Classica* 62 (1993): 1-22.

Schein, Seth L. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Schied-Tissinier. "Remarques sur la representation de l'étranger dans le monde homérique." *Civiltà Classica e Cristiana*, no. 9 (1990): 7-31.

Schmitt, A. *Selbständigkeit und Abhängigkeit menschlichen Handelns bei Homer: Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Psychologie Homers*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990.

Schofield, M. "Euboulia in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 36 (1986): 6-31.

Schroeder, Leopold von. *Mysterium und Mimus im Rigveda*. Leipzig: Haessel, 1908.

Schurtz, Heinrich. *Altersklassen und Männerbünde: Eine Darstellung der Grundformen der Gesellschaft*. Berlin: Reimer, 1902.

Schwabl, Hans. "Religiose Aspekte der *Odyssee*." *Wiener Studien* 91 (1978): 5-28.

Scodel, R. "The removal of the arms, the recognition with Laertes, and narrative tension in the *Odyssey*." *Classical Philology* 93 (1998): 1-17.

Scodel, R. *Epic Facework: Self-presentation and Social Interaction in Homer*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2008.

Scodel, R. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009.

Scott, M. "Some Greek terms in Homer suggesting non-competing attitudes." *Acta Classica* 24 (1981): 1-15.

Scully, S. "The *polis* in Homer: a definition and interpretation." *Ramus* 10, no. 1 (1981): 1-34.

Scully, S. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Seaford, R. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Searle, J.R. *The Rediscovery of the Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.

Sears, Matthew. "Warrior Ants: Elite Troops in the *Iliad*." *CW* 103, no. 2 (2010): 139-155.

Seeck, Gustav Adolf. "Der Streit des Machtigen und des Starken: Motivstruktur und homerische Verhaltenspsychologie im 1. Buch der 'Ilias'." *Hermes* 120, no. 1 (1992): 1-18.

Segal, C. "Kleos and its ironies in the *Odyssey*." *L'Antiquité Classique* 52 (1983): 22-47.

Segal, C. "Divine justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops, and Helios." *American Journal of Philology* 113 (1992): 489-518.

Segal, C. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Sels, Nadia. "The untold death of Laertes: revaluating Odysseus' meeting with his father." *Mnemosyne* 66 (2013): 181-205.

Sergent, Bernard. *Homosexuality in Greek Myth*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.

Severyns, A. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris:, 1928.

Shay, J. *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character*. New York: Atheneum, 1994.

Shay, J. *Odysseus in America: Combat Trauma and the Trials of Homecoming*. New York: Scribner, 2002.

- Sheffield, F.C.C. *Plato's Symposium: The Ethics of Desire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
- Sheppard, J.T. *The Pattern of the Iliad*. London: Methuen, 1922.
- Shields, Kenneth. "On the Indo-European Reflexive." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26, no. 1 (1998): 121-129.
- Shils, E. A. and Janowitz, M. "Cohesion and disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 12, no. 2 (Summer, 1948): 280-315.
- Siebold, G.L., Crabb T. Woodward R. and King, A.C. "Combat, cohesion, and controversy: disputatio sine fine." *Armed Forces & Society* (2015): 1-14.
- Simpkin, Richard. *Race to the Swift: Thoughts on Twenty-First Century Warfare*. London: Brassey's Defense, 1985.
- Simpson, Michael. "Odyssey 9: symmetry and paradox in *outis*." *Classical Journal* 68, no. 1 (Oct-Nov, 1972): 22-25.
- Singor, H.W. "Nine against Troy: on epic phalanges, promachoi, and an old structure in the story of the Iliad." *Mnemosyne* 44 (1991): 17-62.
- Singor, H.W. "*Eni protoisi machesthai*: some remarks on the Iliadic image of the battlefield." In *Homeric Questions*, edited by J.P. Crielaard, 183-200. Amsterdam: Brill, 1995.
- Sinos, Dale. *Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1980.
- Skinner, J.E. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Slater, W.J. "Symptotic ethics in the Odyssey." In *Sympotica*, 213-220. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Slatkin, Laura. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Smith, David. "The Freudian trap in combat motivation theory." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 25, no. 3 (2002): 191-212.
- Snell, Bruno. *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*. Hamburg: Claassen & Goverts, 1948.
- Snodgrass, A. M. "The hoplite reform and history." *JHS* 85 (1965): 110-122.
- Snodgrass, A. M. *The Dark Age of Greece*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971.

Snodgrass, A. M. "The 'hoplite reform' revisited." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19, no. 1 (1993): 47-61.

Spiller, Roger. "S.L.A. Marshall and the ratio of fire." *Royal United Services Institute Journal* 133 (1988): 63-71.

Stagakis, G. "Institutional Aspects of the *Hetairos* Relation." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Stagakis, G. "*Therapontes* and *hetairoi*, in the *Iliad*, as symbols of the political structure of the Homeric state." *Historia* 15, no. 4 (November, 1966): 408-419.

Stagakis, G. "ἑται(ι)ριζο, in Homer, as testimony for the establishment of an *hetairos* relation." *Historia* 20, no. 5/6 (4th Qtr., 1971): 524-533.

Stanford, W. B. *The Ulysses Theme*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Stanford, W. B. *The Odyssey of Homer, with General and Grammatical Introduction, Commentary, and Indexes*. London: Macmillan, 1965.

de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Stein, Dieter and Wright, Susan. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Strasburger, Hermann. "The sociology of the Homeric epics." In *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Talamo, C. "Per le origini dell'eteria arcaica." *La Parola del Passato*, no. 16 (1961): 299.

Taplin, Oliver. "Agamemnon's Role in the *Iliad*." In *Characterization and individuality in Greek literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 60-82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Taplin, O. *Homeric Soundings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Taylor, C.H. "The obstacles to Odysseus' return." In *Essays on the Odyssey*, edited by C.H. Taylor, 87-99. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Tebben, J.R. "Alkinoos and Phaiakian security." *Symbolae Osloenses* 66, no. 1 (2008): 27-45.

Thalmann, W.G. *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Thomas, C.G. "Penelope's worth: looming large in early Greece." *Hermes* 116 (1988): 257-264.

Thompson, N. *The Ship of State: Statecraft and Politics from Ancient Greece to Democratic America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Trümper, Hans. *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos. Untersuchungen zum Wortschatze Homers.*, bk. XI.: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1950.

Trypanis, C.A. "Brothers fighting together in the Iliad." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 106 (1963): 289-297.

Tsagalis, Christos. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Tsagarikis, Odysseus. "The Flashback Technique in Homer: a Transition from Oral to Literary Epic?" *SIFC* 10, no. 1-2 (1992): 781-790.

Turkeltaub, Daniel. "Perceiving Iliadic gods." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103 (2007): 51-81.

Ulf, Christof. *Die Homersche Gesellschaft: Materialien zur Analytischen Beschreibung und Historischen Lokalisierung*. Munich: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1990.

V.M., Udwin. *Between Two Armies: The Place of the Duel in Epic Culture*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Vernant, J.-P. "Hestia-Hermès. Sur l'expression religieuse de l'espace et du mouvement chez les Grecs." *L'Homme* 3, no. 3 (1963): 12-50.

Vernant, J.-P. *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*. Paris: F. Maspero, 1974.

Versnel, Henk. *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Vian, P. "La fonction guerrière dans la mythologie grecque." In *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*, edited by J.-P. Vernant, 64-66. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Vine, B. "On the expression of the reflexive possession in the Rig-Veda: RV svá-." In *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes ancienne*, edited by E. Pirart, 203-214. Sabadell: Ausa, 1997.

Virilio, Paul. *L'horizon négatif: essai de dromoscopie*. Paris: Galilée, 1984.

Wackernagel, Jacob. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916.

Walcot, P. "Odysseus and the art of lying." In *Homer's Odyssey*, edited by L. Doherty, 135-154. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Walsh, T. R. "Odyssey 1.6-9: a little more than kine." *Mnemosyne* 48, no. 4 (September, 1995): 385-410.

Walsh, T. R. *Fighting Words and Feuding Words: Anger and the Homeric Poems*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005.

Watkins, C. "Towards PIE syntax: problems and pseudoproblems." In *Papers from the parasession on diachronic syntax*, edited by S.B. Steever, 305-326. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, 1976.

Watkins, C. "A propos de Menis." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 72 (1977): 187-209.

Watkins, C. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Webster, T. B. L. *From Mycenae to Homer*. London: Methuen, 1958.

van Wees, Hans. "Leaders of Men? Military Organization in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 36 (1986): 285-303.

van Wees, H. "Kings in Combat: Battles and Heroes in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 38 (1988): 1-24.

van Wees, H. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1992.

van Wees, H. *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Duckworth, 1994.

van Wees, H. "The Homeric War of Way (Part 1)." *GaR* 41 (1994): 1-18.

van Wees, H. "The Homeric Way of War (Part 2)." *GaR* 41 (1994): 131-155.

van Wees, H. "Heroes, knights, and nutters: warrior mentality in Homer." In *Battle in Antiquity*, edited by A. B. Lloyd, 1-86. Swansea: Duckworth, Classical Press of Wales, 1996.

van Wees, H. "Homeric Warfare." In *A New Companion to Homer*, edited by Ian Morris and Barry Powell, 668-693. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Weil, Simone. *L'Illiade ou le poème de la force*. Marseille: Les Cahiers du Sud, 1939.

Weiser, Lily. "Altgermanische Jünglingsweihe und Männerbünde." PhD diss., Bühl, 1927.

Welskopf, E. "Die Bezeichnungen lawos, demos, plethus, ethnos in den homerischen Epen." In *Soziale Typenbegriffe*, edited by E. Welskopf. Vol. 3. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981.

Welwei, K.W. "Polis-Bildung, Hetairos-Gruppen und Hetairien." *Gymnasium* 99 (1992): 487-495.

- Wender, Dorothea. *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Wenger, Rupert. *Strategie, Taktik und Gefechtstechnik in der Ilias: Analyse der Kampfbeschreibungen der Ilias*. Hamburg: Kovac, 2008.
- Wessely, Simon. "Twentieth-century Theories on Combat Motivation and Breakdown." *Journal of Contemporary History* 41, no. 2 (2006): 269-286.
- West, S. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey 1: Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- West, S. "Laertes revisited." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 35 (1989): 113-143.
- Wheeler, E. "Land Battles." In *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, edited by van Wees H. Sabin, P. and M. Whitby, 186-223. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Wheeler, E. "Mad Hatters and March Hares." In *New Perspectives on Military History*, edited by L.L. Brice and J.T. Roberts, 53-104., bk. 10. Claremont, CA: Regina Press, 2011.
- White, Colin. "The Nelson Touch: The Evolution of Nelson's Tactics at Trafalgar." *Journal for Maritime Studies* 7, no. 1 (2005): 123-139.
- Whiting, Jennifer. "The Nicomachean account of philia." In *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Ethics*, edited by Richard Kraut, 277-304. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Whitman, C. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Whitman, C. *The Heroic Paradox: Essays on Homer, Sophocles, and Aristophanes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976.
- Wiesemann, Ursula. "Grammaticalized coreference." In *Pronoun Systems*, edited by Ursula Wiesemann, 437-481. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986.
- Wikander, Stig. *Der arische Männerbund*. Lund: Gleerups, 1938.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1916.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus: Neue homerische Untersuchungen*.: Georg Olms Verlag, 1927.
- Willcock, M.M. *A Companion to the Iliad*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Williams, Bernard. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Winterbottom, M. "Speaking of the gods." *Greece and Rome* 36 (1989): 33-41.

Wöhrle, G. *Telemachs Reise: Väter und Söhne in Ilias und Odyssee oder ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Männlichkeitsideologie in der homerischen Welt*, bk. 124. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

Woodard, R.D. *Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Woodhouse, W. J. *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Woolsey, R. B. "Repeated narratives in the Odyssey." *Classical Philology* 36 (1941): 167-181.

Wyatt, W. "Homeric and Mycenaean laos." *Minos* 29-30 (1994-1995): 159-170.

Yamagata, Naoko. *Homeric Morality*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Zanker, Graham. *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Neuropsychiatry in World War II. Edited by R. Anderson and A. Glass. Washington, DC: Office of the Surgeon General, 1966-1973.

The Ages of Homer: a tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule. Edited by Jane B. Carter and Sarah P. Morris. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Reciprocity in Ancient Greece. Edited by Postlethwaite Norman Gill, Christopher and Richard Seaford. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Edited by A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Homeri Opera. Edited by P. von der Mühl. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1946.

The Homeric Hymn to Demeter. Edited by N.J. Richardson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. Edited by B. Snell. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955-2010.

Subjectivity and Subjectivization: Linguistic Perspectives. Edited by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Homer: A Collection of Critical Essays. Edited by George Steiner and Robert Fagles. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

The American Soldier (4 vols.). Edited by S.A. Stouffer. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.