Check for updates

Greece & Rome (2025), 72.1 38–64 © The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
doi:10.1017/S0017383524000196

ACHILLES INAUGURATES HIS CULT*

Recent archaeological discoveries, as well as new readings of the epic, suggest that the poet of the *Iliad* was well aware of hero cult. The funeral of Patroklos in *Iliad* 23 has long been recognized as also representing the funeral of Achilles. But moving away from Neoanalysis and Neo-neoanalysis, I argue that the rituals Achilles performs on behalf of his friend point to the future establishment of Achilles' own cult that will eternally link his name to that of Patroklos. Each action Achilles performs on behalf of his friend offers a blueprint or a script for the rituals intended to constitute the *dromena* of Achilles' future cult. While no actual cult of Achilles may have followed this scenario, the Homeric audience would have understood its components – mourning, feasting, ritual impurity, hair offerings, holocausts, and funeral games – as an *aition*, a ritual foundation, inaugurating Achilles' cult.

Keywords: hero cult, Homer, *Iliad* 23, Patroklos, Achilles, ritual, *aition*

Book 23 of the *Iliad* describes the funeral of Patroklos, followed by games held in his honour. The funeral proper takes three days (1–61, 109–225, and 226–57). In the night after the first day, Patroklos appears to Achilles and begs to be buried (65–107). The funeral games in honour of Patroklos bring the book to a close (257–897). My focus here will be on the first part of the book, the funeral of Patroklos.

It has long been suggested that the rites for Patroklos in some sense also represent the funeral of Achilles, which lies outside the *Iliad*'s time

* Gunnel Ekroth and Ivana and Andrej Petrovic, all far more expert in matters of Greek religion than I, generously read different drafts and gave me helpful comments and encouragement. I am also grateful to the organizers, Irene Polinskaya, Saskia Peels-Matthey, and Sol Tor, for inviting me to present an abbreviated version to the Language of Greek Religion Seminar; and finally, Adrian Kelly, for generously shared his forthcoming commentary on *Iliad* 23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

frame.[1] The Iliadic narrative of Patroklos' funeral, it has been argued, has its source in pre-existing material depicting the burial of Achilles, material that has been subsequently inserted into the *Iliad* but betrays its foreign origin by certain details that would be appropriate for the heroic funeral of an Achilles but incongruous for Patroklos. As will emerge, I find such explanations inadequate but intend to propose a rather different approach to what I see as a purposeful conflation of the two funerals. Moreover, I suggest that each action of Achilles in carrying out Patroklos' funeral can be read as a blueprint or a script, the *legomena*, so to speak, for the rituals that will henceforth constitute the *dromena* of a future joint cult of Achilles and Patroklos. While I do not claim that the rituals envisaged by the epic were actually performed, I do attempt to demonstrate that the poet and his audience would understand those acts, as an *aition* inaugurating a hero cult.

In making my argument, I will first show how Homer merges, or superimposes, the rites for Achilles with those of Patroklos; but the technique I discern here is not a palimpsest where the original text has been overwritten with a new one, but instead a fusion of two narratives that mirror each other with a double resonance. This technique, moreover, is also operative elsewhere in the poem. I will then argue that the *Iliad* poet shows an awareness of hero cult, before turning to an examination of the rituals described in *Iliad* 23.1–257, and conclude with a glance at the description of Achilles' own funeral in the final book of the *Odyssey*.

It must be confessed at the outset that the *Iliad* is not a handbook of rituals – my argument depends both on archaeological evidence from different periods as well as much later literary sources – and the Homeric poems, as has been maintained, may themselves be the source of certain conceptions and practices. Thus, my conclusions must

[1] Cf., e.g., C. E. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), 201: 'The death of Patroklos is a shadow play of the death of Achilles, a montage of one image upon another.' Similarly M. Edwards, 'The Conventions of the Homeric Funeral', in J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green (eds.), *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster,* vol. 1 (Bristol, 1986), 84, notes: 'the rites for Patroklos merge into those of Achilles himself'; cf. A. Schnapp-Gourbeillon, 'Les funérailles de Patrocle', in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge/Paris, 1982), 86: 'on peut soutenir que les funérailles de Patrocle sont celles qu'Achille célèbre aussi pour lui-même' ('it can be argued that the funeral rites Achilles celebrates for Patroclus are also the ones he celebrates for himself'). F. Horn, 'The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*: Motif Transference and Poetic Technique', *Mnemosyne* 74 (2021), 1–28, emphasizes not the funeral of Patroklos, but the events leading up to his death as doublets of Achilles' fate along the lines of Burgess' 'motif transference' (see nn. 5 and 6), thus allowing Achilles to acquire the hero's immortal fame even before his actual demise.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

remain speculative, but I hope to marshal enough evidence at least to make a persuasive case.

Book 22 closed with the laments of Priam, Hecuba, and Andromache as they watch the dead body of Hector dragged in the dust across the Trojan plain by Achilles. Book 23 opens with the Greeks returning to the Hellespont and their ships. Achilles, however, refuses to allow his Myrmidons to scatter, but insists that they remain on their chariots, still in their armour, and make a procession mourning the corpse of Patroklos ὃ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων ('for this is the honour due the dead,' 23.9). Only afterwards should they unyoke their horses and take their supper. Achilles leads the way, and they circle the corpse three times while μετὰ δέ σφι Θέτις γόου ἵμερον ὦρσε ('among them Thetis aroused the desire for lamentation', 23.14).

The mention of Thetis here has been considered not only abrupt, but also superfluous; the Greeks seem perfectly capable of mourning Patroklos without divine motivation. Moreover, Thetis' presence here has seemed to be a pale imitation of her more elaborate intervention at the beginning of Book 18 (35–114) where, from the depth of the sea, she and her Nereid sisters first hear Achilles' wailing. Arriving at the Trojan shore with shrill keening and leading off the lament of her sisters, Thetis there asks her son the cause of his grief; after all, Zeus has fulfilled his promise to visit suffering on the Greeks.[2] That pledge, however, means nothing to Achilles, who now wishes he had never been born, but lives only to avenge the death of Patroklos. She, in turn, announces that Achilles' death will follow soon upon the death of Hector. This intervention of Thetis in Book 18 has long been regarded as 'one of the oldest and most central planks of Neoanalysis'.[3]

Allow me a short digression here. While focusing on the scene in Book 18, Adrian Kelly has laid out in detail both the older and more recent versions of Neoanalysis in relation to the Homeric problem; both constitute a kind of *Quellenforschung*, where inconsistencies or incoherences in the *Iliad* reveal something not quite appropriate, the incorporation of a foreign body into a new context.[4] The older approaches posited the sources in pre-existing texts from the Epic

[2] The repetition at 18.73–4 of 1.362–3 reminds us that the promise made there, as Thetis points out, is now fulfilled.

[3] A. Kelly, 'The Mourning of Thetis: "Allusion" and the Future of the *Iliad*', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (Berlin/Boston, 2012), 222; cf. J. T. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund, 1949), 65–75.

[4] Kelly (n. 3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cycle, in the present case, especially, the *Aethiopis* or its precursor; the newer form (Neo-neoanalysis) discerns the incorporation not of texts but of adaptations of traditional motifs, or what Burgess has called 'motif transference'.[5] He sums up the oralist position:

> Arguments that depend heavily on details of a textual nature are weak, especially when they posit vestigial mistakes as opposed to allusive triggers that are intertextually linked not with other specific poems but rather with traditional mythological narratives. Some correspondences involve typology, but heroic motifs that are inappropriate for Patroklos are suggestive of the death of Achilles *fabula*, especially when they are part of a sequence of convincing cases of motif transference.[6]

Nevertheless, both approaches have in common the notion that inconsistencies can be detected and arise from the assimilation or transference of imported material; the difference, as Kelly points out,

> seems in practice not much more than a cosmetic change, as in the continued use of narrative inconsistency . . . without any redefinition of the concept of (in)consistency itself. The best answer to such arguments remains the one which has been invoked against Neoanalysis since its inception: the inconsistency, properly understood and contextualised in the poet's traditional technique, is not an inconsistency at all.[7]

Kelly goes on to argue that the scene of Thetis' arrival in Book 18 should not be considered as borrowed or adapted from another source,

[5] Cf. J. Burgess, *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore, 2009), 70: 'The intertextuality [of motif transference] is not between texts but between the Homeric poems and pre-Homeric oral traditions. These traditions cannot be equated with particular poems, and it is not text that is transferred, in the sense of words and phrases, but rather notional motifs (consisting of narrative actions) that have traditionally been applied to specific heroes.' For Neoanalysis, which was nevertheless a mutation of traditional Analytic approaches to Homer, see especially H. Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. (Erlenbach/Zurich, 1945); Kakridis (n. 3); W. Schadewaldt, 'Einblick in die Erfindung der *Ilias*', in *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, fourth edition (Stuttgart, 1965), 155–202; W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden, 1960); W. Kullmann, 'Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung', *WS* 15 (1981), 5–42; W. Kullmann, 'Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research', *GRBS* 25 (1984), 307–23; W. Kullmann, '*Ilias* und *Aithiopis*,' *Hermes* 133 (2004), 9–28. In his 1984 article, Kullmann concedes that the sources invoked by Neoanalysts may have been oral traditional rather than written ones, but he nevertheless insists that a literate Homer refined and ordered his traditional sources. B. Currie, *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford, 2016), esp. 55–77, returns to the older version of Neoanalysis with allusions to prior texts, although he too concedes that the Homeric poet revised his inherited material. Already M. M. Willcock, 'The Funeral Games of Patroklos', *BICS* 20 (1973), 9, noted: 'There is no reason to suppose that he [Homer] was imitating the plot of a hypothetical predecessor of the cyclic *Aethiopis*; nor on the other hand that Homer himself provided the *Iliad*, in Patroklos, the model which the *Aethiopis* poet was to use in time to come [this being the argument of M. L. West, '*Iliad* and *Aithiopis*', *CQ* 53 (2003), 1–14]. The whole picture is a good deal less simple'.

[6] Burgess (n. 5), 92.

[7] Kelly (n. 3), 228, n. 20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but instead be understood as a variant of a typical pattern of what he calls 'proleptic mourning' whose multiple occurrences in the *Iliad* he proceeds to analyze. But while Kelly's rejection of Neoanalytic interpretations is persuasive, in this particular case, his own survey of the parallel passages demonstrates that the intervention of Thetis here remains exceptional. First, as Kelly recognizes, Thetis is always proleptically mourning her son's death, of which she, as goddess, has certain knowledge.[8] Second, as already mentioned, Θέτις δ' ἐξῆρχε γόοιο ('Thetis led off the lament', 18.51) is a technical term for ritual mourning, and third, Thetis' gesture of holding Achilles' head is not elsewhere found in cases of proleptic mourning.[9] Moreover, Achilles' posture, 'grand and grandly stretched out in the dust' (ἐν κονίῃσι μέγας μεγαλωστὶ τανυσθείς, 18.26), is described as if he were a dead warrior.[10] Finally, while there is no need to resort to an external source, the scene does in fact allude to, or perhaps better, adumbrates a future funeral of Achilles as envisaged by the *Iliad*. As Edwards puts it: 'few artists have so skilfully superimposed the present action and the future result'.[11]

The merging of the two funerals, begun in Book 18, resumes in Book 23. Here the mention of Thetis arousing mourning among the Myrmidons should not be viewed as an intrusion grafted onto the funeral of Patroklos from its original context (again from the *Aethiopis*);[12] rather, lines 17–18 recall the passage in Book 18 as if to remind us of the earlier scene.[13] It is, however, surprising that Burgess, the leading proponent of the oralist form of Neoanalysis, maintains in this case that the phrase μετὰ δέ σφι Θέτις γόου ἵμερον ὦρσε does not necessarily indicate Thetis' physical presence – which would in fact be expected at the funeral of her son.[14] According to Burgess, then, it 'would seem to be an insignificant conflation between

[8] Kelly (n. 3), 249–50. The other examples of the pattern differ in various, but fundamental, ways: Agamemnon's mourning for Menelaus and Penelope's mourning for Odysseus possess a certain irony since we know that neither the king's brother nor Odysseus has died. Andromache's premature mourning for Hector, on the other hand, heightens the pathos.

[9] Cf. *Il.* 18.71, 317; 23.136; 24.712, 724; and M. Andronikos, *Totencult, Archaeologia Homerica 3 W* (Göttingen, 1968), 11–12.

[10] The phrase occurred at *Il.* 16.775–6 of Patroklos, again linking the two heroes.

[11] Edwards (n. 1), 87. Cf. Burgess' 'motif transference'.

[12] Cf., e.g., Kakridis (n. 3), 84.

[13] *Il.* 23.17–18 = 18.316–17. Cf. Kakridis (n. 3), 84: 'Homer took verse 14 – and with it v. 13 – bodily from an epic description of Achilles' funeral where the presence of the goddess was both necessary and explicit to use it for Patroklos'. Kakridis subsequently identifies the source as the *Aethiopis*.

[14] Burgess (n. 5), 91. Thetis is in fact present, as one would expect, in *Odyssey* 24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the mourning for Patroklos and the mourning for Achilles', but 'not a purposeful allusion . . . the line suggests that the emotional state of the Myrmidons was inspired by a divinity, as often in Homer; it is not necessary to conclude that Thetis was actually present among the Myrmidons'.[15] Agreed, but Thetis is not some generic divinity, and her mention here invites us to glimpse a *purposeful* conflation between the two funerals, what Burgess elsewhere calls 'allusive triggers', but here intra-textual rather than extra-textual.

Just as the early books of the *Iliad* re-enact the beginnings of the Trojan War, the final books allude to its end with the fall of Troy and its aftermath. We can point to whole episodes – the Catalogue of Ships, the duel between Paris and Menelaus, and the breaking of the truce – that logically belong to the earliest stages of the Trojan expedition, and which have also been subject to Neoanalytic interpretations as being smuggled into the *Iliad* from external sources. Priam's speech in Book 22 offers a vivid image of the horrors accompanying Troy's fall. More subtle are the foreshadowings in the wrestling match in Book 23.708–34 of Odysseus' impending defeat of Telemonian Ajax in the contest over the arms of Achilles; similarly, tripped up by Athena in the footrace, Locrian Ajax's ignominious fall, with his mouth filled with dung, alludes to the boasting which will be his undoing (23.773–7, cf. *Od.* 4.499–511).[16] But to my mind the closest parallel to the mention of Thetis in Book 23 is an incident from the beginning of the *Iliad*, when in Book 3 Aphrodite appears to Helen in the guise of an old wool-working woman who had accompanied her mistress on her journey to Troy (3.383–9). Her presence here harks back to Sparta and the locus of Helen's first seduction by Paris. When Aphrodite summons Helen to the bedchamber, by evoking that moment that will become the *casus belli*, the poet invites us to recognize the allusion to the past and its re-enactment in the following scene when Helen is willy-nilly seduced all over again.

The mention of Thetis at the opening of Book 23 serves a similar function, but there it alludes not to the past but to the future and to the double function of the rites for Patroklos. We have here, then, neither an insignificant conflation nor an awkward sign of borrowing

[15] Burgess (n. 5), 92.

[16] Cf. A. Rengakos, 'Το χαμόγελο του Αχιλλέα. Η *Ιλιάδα* και το είδωλό της', in *Το χαμόγελο του Αχιλλέα. Θέματα αφήγησης και ποιητικής στα ομηρικά έπη* (Athens, 2006), 17–30, for Book 23 mirroring both past and future events.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from an episode from Achilles' funeral; rather, the allusion evokes a kind of superimposition of two episodes, creating a double perspective. The goddess's presence constitutes a typically Homeric *sema*, if I can call it that, a sign that already signals the double function of the rites for Patroklos, which simultaneously inaugurate the rites for her son.

Book 23 offers another indication of such a double function, one whose significance has not to my knowledge been recognized. A striking feature of the funeral games for Patroklos is the distribution of prizes. Every contestant receives a prize no matter how he fared in the competition; moreover, the prizes are unceremoniously carried off – or rather snatched up – by the participants.[17] The purpose of these procedures is to put the possessions of the deceased – often valuable property, frequently with a significant history – back into circulation, thereby not only commemorating the occasion, but also perpetuating the memory of the deceased, while also adding another chapter to the object's history. As Grethlein puts it:

> The funeral games set up a net of commemorative relations which centre on the prizes: the organizer hands out prizes so that the dead are remembered; the winners gain a place in public memory for winning the prizes, and they remember the host on account of those prizes.[18]

Here, however, the position of the host and the deceased are blurred. Unlike the practice of gift-exchange that characterizes Homeric *xenia*, the function of the prizes at funerary events thus has a different purpose. As Redfield notes:

> In the funeral games one is said to *ktereizein aethloisi*, to use up property with prizes (XXII.646). The prizes include the dead man's most precious possessions—in Patroklos' case, for instance, a Phoenician cup called "the most beautiful in the world" (XXIII.742), which Patroklos had received as ransom for Lycaon; and also the armor which Patroklos had stripped from Sarpedon (XXIII.800). Such objects

[17] Cf. L. Gernet, 'Jeux et droit (Remarques sur le XXIII. chant de l'*Iliade*)', in *Droit et Société dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1955), 9–18, who emphasizes the distinction between the appropriation of prizes by the contestants at the funeral games and gift-giving. The contest between Hector and Ajax in *Iliad* 7 ends with an exchange of gifts; in the athletic games of the Phaeacians, no prizes are awarded. It is unclear whether the tripod Hesiod won at the funeral of Amphidamas was the sole award. As a general rule, in the historic period, only a first prize was awarded in athletic competitions; the awarding of a second prize at the Panathenaia seems to be exceptional.

[18] J. Grethlein, 'Epic Narrative and Ritual. The Case of the Funeral Games in the *Iliad*', in A. Bierl, R. Lämmle, and K. Wesselmann (eds.), *Literatur und Religion 1: Wege zu einer mythisch/rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen* (Berlin/Boston, 2007), 168–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have both a value and a history, and the man that receives them remembers their source.[19]

In the aftermath of the chariot race, Achilles awarded Eumelus, whose chariot was broken by Athena, Asteropaios' breastplate, the ambidextrous warrior he had slain by the Scamander (23.560–2, cf. 21.140–204); he also gives away an iron throwing weight he sacked from the city of Eetion, father of Andromache (23.826–9), whom Achilles had slain (6.414–417). Finally, for the spear-throwing contest between Ajax and Diomedes, Achilles announces that both participants will share in the arms of Sarpedon won by Patroklos in his *aristeia* with the Lycian king, but the winner will receive an additional prize: a silver-studded dagger which Achilles says, 'I stripped from Asteropaios' (23.805–9). The contest is cut short when Diomedes is on the point of doing grievous bodily harm to his opponent, but he nevertheless receives Asteropaios' dagger.

Thus, Achilles is giving away, not only the property of his dead friend, but also his own, acquired by his force of arms. His gesture in distributing his own belongings would have averted Homer's audience that Achilles intends to make Patroklos' funeral also his own. He is, so to speak, a dead man walking.[20] To be sure, the full distribution of Achilles' possessions, most notoriously his arms, is deferred for now. But neither will the *phiale* containing Patroklos' bones be sealed nor the grave tumulus fully erected until Achilles' remains are added, as the *Odyssey* tells us, in a golden urn (24.74–7).[21] The rituals surrounding Patroklos' funeral thus point ahead to the future establishment of Achilles' own cult, which will eternally be linked with his friend Patroklos.

[19] J. M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago, 1975), 201–6; cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen,* vol. 1 (Tübingen, 1894), 20, n. 1, who notes that 'κτερεΐζειν heisst, den Todten seine κτέρεα, d. h. seine ehemaligen Besitzthümer (durch Verbrennung) mitgeben' ('κτερεΐζειν means to give to the dead man his κτέρεα, i.e. his former possessions [by burning them]'); also vol.1, 24, n. 3. The athletic prizes, however, are not burned, but distributed among the participants in the funeral rituals.

[20] Cf. J. Grethlein, 'Eine Anthropologie des Essens: Der Essensstreit in der "Ilias" und die Erntemetapher in *Il.* 19.221–41', *Hermes* 133 (2005), 259: 'auch noch nach der Rache an Hektor steht Achill nicht nur am Rande des griechischen Heeres, sondern an der Grenze des menschlichen Lebens im allgemeinen. Indem er sich von den Grundlagen des Lebens abschneidet, erzeugt er Nähe zum toten Patroklos' ('even after taking his revenge on Hector, Achilles remains not only in a marginal position *vis-à-vis* the Greek army, but also on the boundary of the human life in general. By cutting himself off from the fundamental necessities of life, he creates a proximity to the dead Patroklos').

[21] On this urn, see the discussion below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is useful to pause here to give a general, if skeletal, definition of hero cult in order to differentiate it from funerary rituals and ancestor worship with which it shares many features.[22] I define hero cult as the recurring ritual worship of the dead, but one not limited to the relatives of the deceased, often performed at the burial site, but celebrated by the larger community. Moreover, unlike the ordinary dead, the hero maintains some power, whether for good or ill, so that the community can invoke his aid or attempt to avoid his displeasure. Plutarch's description (*Arist.* 21) of the cult for the fallen heroes of Marathon fulfills these three criteria with public sacrifice at the tumulus of the fallen warriors and its annual recurrence on a specified date. Admittedly, the earliest indications, which rely on archaeological evidence, pose special problems: how can one distinguish private burials from ancestral cults involving families or clans practised over an extended period from hero cults? With difficulty.[23] Moreover, when discussing Homer and hero cult, the lack of consensus on the dating of Homer (eighth century? seventh? sixth?) creates further problems.[24] However, later evidence – whether literary, archaeological, or inscriptional – for such cults dedicated to mythical heroes, founders, and civic heroes is well documented. Such annual festivals could include processions, libations, a variety of sacrifices and/or holocausts,

[22] D. Boehringer, *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit* (Berlin, 2001), 25, helpfully notes that 'Der Versuch, den Begriff "Heros" klar und eindeutig zu definieren, gleicht demjenigen, einen Pudding an eine Wand zu nageln' ('The attempt to clearly and unambiguously define the notion of a "hero" is almost the same as trying to nail a pudding to a wall'). G. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Period* (Liège, 2002), 21, however, attempts to nail the pudding, giving a succinct definition of heroes and their cults and attesting to their diversity: 'The cult of the ordinary dead is a private matter, of concern only to the family. A hero, on the other hand, even though he is a historical person, is not connected with the family but belongs to the public sphere. Families and private persons worship heroes, but they are mainly of concern to the community or groups of the community and are *worshipped on a more official level than the ordinary dead*' (italics in original). See also G. Ekroth, 'Heroes and Hero-Cults', in D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion* (Oxford, 2007), 100–14; G. Ekroth, 'The Cult of Heroes', in S. Albersmeier and M. J. Anderson (eds.), *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, 2009), 120–43.

[23] See, for instance, C. C. Aslan, 'A Place of Burning: Hero or Ancestor Cult at Troy', *Hesperia* 80 (2011), 422: 'Because Troy has such a prominent place in the Homeric epics, it is tempting to interpret ritual activity near Bronze Age tombs at the site as Homeric hero worship; nevertheless, it is equally possible that the activities at the Place of Burning may have been associated with local ancestors or a more general cult of the dead, rather than with specific Homeric heroes.' Boehringer (n. 22), 40–6, doubts the existence of ancestor cult in Greece; if true, it would do away with attempts to distinguish hero cult from ancestor cult.

[24] For a succinct overview on recent work on the origins of hero cult and the difficulties involved, see Boehringer (n. 22), 13–24. His study limits itself to the archaeological evidence in Attika, the Argolid, and Messina (thereby bypassing Euboeia and Boeotia) and consciously avoids literary material.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

public banquets, and athletic contests.[25] Not long ago, it was the scholarly consensus that hero cult evolved under the influence of heroic epic, and indeed the eighth century bears witness to a proliferation of ritual activity at Mycenaean sites, especially at tombs.[26] But to make epic responsible for the 'invention' of hero cult seems inherently implausible. Hero cult is local, celebrated and moulded by the need to create civic bonds within a local community; epic, on the other hand – or at least Homeric epic – is, or bills itself to be, Panhellenic. It seems far more likely that the heroes of epic were adopted or assimilated to local practices of veneration than the other way around.[27]

Long ago, Rohde argued that *Seelencult* (cult of the dead) both pre-dated and post-dated the development of the Homeric poems. In the offerings, especially the holocausts in honour of the deceased, Rohde saw a contradiction to the Homeric view of the afterlife in which the dead, once cremated, no longer have any power, especially over the living;[28] and he detected traces of pre-Homeric hero cult in the description of Patroklos' funeral.[29] The discoveries at Lefkandi and Mycenean sites, which demonstrate continuity of ritual sites from Late Helladic IIIc into the early Geometric period, as well as a more nuanced understanding of the nature of hero cult have now rendered the picture more complex.[30] While there may have been an

[25] Cf. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22). For funerary contests in the historical period, see L. Roller, 'Funeral Games for Historical Persons', *Stadion* 7 (1981), 1–18.

[26] Cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, 1921), 340: 'Much hero-cult was directly engendered by the powerful influence of Homer and other epics'. Cf. J. N. Coldstream, 'Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer', *JHS* 96 (1976), 9–17. For a survey and discussion of the complexities involved in dealing with hero cult, see C. M. Antonaccio, 'Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece', *AJA* 98 (1994), 389–410; C. M. Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece* (Lanham, MD, 1995).

[27] For cult and colonization, see C. M. Antonaccio, 'Colonization and the Origins of Hero Cult', in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (Stockholm, 1999), 109–21.

[28] Cf. Rohde (n. 19), vol. 1, 14–22; A. Snodgrass, 'Les origines du culte des héros dans la Grèce antique', in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge/Paris, 1982), 107–19. R. Garland, 'Γέρας θανόντων. An Investigation into the Claims of the Homeric Dead', *AncSoc* 15–17 (1984–6), 5–22, likewise insists that in Homer the dead have no power over the living, but both Hector (*Il.* 22.358) and, at the bottom of the social ladder, Elpenor (*Od.* 11.73) warn that they can become a θεῶν μήνιμα ('cause of divine wrath') if they do not receive proper burial. The implication, however, is that once buried they will lose that power as is also implied by Patroklos' ghost.

[29] Rohde (n. 19), vol. 1, 22 notes: 'Es kann nicht der geringste Zweifel darüber bestehen, dass in der Bestattungsfeier für Patroklos nicht ein Keim neuer Bildungen, sondern ein 'Rudiment' des lebhafteren Seelenkult einer vergangenen Zeit zu erkennen ist.' ('There cannot be the slightest doubt that in the funeral ceremony for Patroklos one should recognize not a germ of new developments, but rather a "rudiment" of a more active soul cult of bygone times.')

[30] Cf. M. Deoudi, *Heroenkulte in homerischer Zeit* (Oxford, 1999), 27: 'Die archäologischen Funde belegen auch, daß neben der religiösen Vorstellung auch die architektonischen

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

upsurge in hero cult in the eighth century, it may be due as much to the related contemporary phenomena of Panhellenism, colonization, and the 'rise' of the *polis* as to the influence of epic.

Thus, the archaeological evidence no longer insists on hero cult as a post-Homeric phenomenon. As a result, Homeric epic has received renewed scrutiny for embedded traces of hero cult. Specific indications have been detected in several passages.[31] Hector's boast at *Il.* 7.84–91 suggests some form of hero cult localized at a mound overlooking the Hellespont.[32] However, the tomb beside the Hellespont that Hector imagines will not contain his defeated enemy; rather, as we learn at *Odyssey* 24.80–4, it will become the communal tumulus of Achilles and Patroklos. The unusual fate of Sarpedon, who dies on the Trojan plain, but is airlifted to Lycia (*Il.* 16.431–57, 666–83), also suggests hero cult;[33] we know he received heroic honours in the historical period. Only in these two Homeric passages does the verb ταρχύω (to bury

Strukturen, die für den Kult genutzt wurden, schon durchgängig seit der PG-Zeit nachweisbar sind. So wird deutlich, daß der Heroenkult ein in einer langen Tradition entstandener Kult und keine "Neuschöpfung" der homerischen Zeit ist.' ('The archaeological finds also prove that, along with the religious concept, the architectural structures used for cult purposes were already in evidence from the P[roto]G[eometric] period. This shows that the cult of heroes has a long history of development and is not a "new creation" of the Homeric period.') Cf. Antonaccio, 'Contesting the Past' (n. 26) for a survey of the bibliography and the distinction between tomb cult and hero cult; also Snodgrass (n. 28); Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors* (n. 26); A. Mazarakis-Ainian, 'Reflections on Hero Cults in Early Iron Age Greece', in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (Stockholm, 1999), 9–36; Deoudi, *Heroenkulte* (n. 30); Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22). Irene Lemos *per litteras* noted that DNA tests have not yet been carried out for the burials at Toumba (Lefkandi); they would show whether or not all the burials belong to the same family or clan. On the basis of the transference of bones, well known in the historical period, M. Lindbloom and G. Ekroth, 'Heroes, Ancestors or Just any Old Bones? Contextualizing the Consecration of Human Remains from the Mycenaean Shaft Graves at Lerna in the Argolid', in E. Alram-Stern, F. Blakolmer, S. Deger-Jalkotzy, et al. (eds.), *Metaphysis: Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Liège, 2016), 235–42, have argued for hero cult in the Mycenean period.

[31] The reference to a cult of Erechtheus at *Il.* 2.547–51 has long been viewed as an Athenian interpolation. Perhaps this should be reconsidered?

[32] On these lines, see A. Petrovic, 'Archaic Funerary Epigram and Hektor's Imagined Epitymbia', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou (eds.), *Homeric Receptions: Literature and the Performing Arts* (Berlin/Boston, 2016), 45–58; J. Strauss Clay, 'Homer's Epigraph: *Iliad* 7.87–91', *Philologus* 160 (2016), 185–96.

[33] For Sarpedon in the *Iliad*, see J. Strauss Clay, 'How to be a Hero: The Case of Sarpedon', in E. Karamalengou and E. Makrygianni (eds.), *Ἀντιφίλησις: Festschrift for J-Th. Papadimitriou* (Stuttgart, 2009), 30–8. For the tension between mortality and immortality defining the hero, see C. Delattre, 'Entre mortalité et immortalité: L'example de Sarpedon dans l'*Iliade*', *RPh* 80 (2006), 259–71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

solemnly) occur; it may in fact be, as Nagy has argued, the *vox propria* for the performance of heroic cult.[34]

The absence of explicit reference to hero cult could be considered an example of the phenomenon of 'epic distancing,' which seeks to differentiate the world of the epic heroes from the lived space of the epic's audience.[35] In a recent discussion, Currie reviews the issue of hero cult in Homer and argues that the 'reason why hero cult is virtually absent from Homeric epic is because it has been suppressed, not because it was unknown. This suppression calls for an explanation.'[36]

He then lists two views to account for the epic's apparent downplaying of hero cult: first, since its heroes are considered living characters, it would be anachronistic to depict them as figures of cult; second, Homeric epic avoids allusion to hero cults because such cults are inherently localized, whereas the epic is Panhellenic. Currie's own explanation insists on the 'literary aims of Homeric epic', that 'hero cult is incompatible with the whole outlook of the Homeric poems' and that 'the elevated, tragic, and pathetic effect aimed at . . . requires that death be total and not compromised, as it would be by reference to posthumous cults'.[37]

Currie's discussion inspired Nagy to restate his view, which goes back to the beginnings of his career, of the centrality and pervasiveness of hero cult in Homer:

> I am saying only that Homeric poetry avoids overt references to hero cult. To say it another way, references to hero cult are implicit, not explicit, in Homeric poetry. And, as I argue, Homeric poetry not only 'alludes' to hero cult but also actually integrates the mentality of hero cult into the overall narratives of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[38]

While Nagy and Currie have substantial disagreements concerning the character and development of the Homeric poems, they nevertheless agree that hero cult is contemporaneous with Homer, but also that it

[34] G. Nagy, 'The Death of Sarpedon and the question of Homeric Uniqueness', in *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, 1990), 131–3, 138–9, but see B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford, 2005), 51, n. 32.

[35] Cf. Redfield (n. 19), 36–7.

[36] Currie (n. 34), 48–57; the quotation derives from p. 55.

[37] Currie (n. 34), 56–7.

[38] G. Nagy, 'Signs of Hero Cult in Homeric Poetry', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (Berlin/Boston, 2012), 27–71; cf. G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, 1979), 94–117.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is 'suppressed' (Currie) or left 'implicit' (Nagy) within the epics; nevertheless, as I have argued, its traces are by no means completely obliterated.

I would be inclined to reformulate and perhaps to render more precise both Nagy's thesis and Currie's formulation ('literary aims of Homeric epic') by drawing a parallel of the marginalization of hero cult in Homer to a passage at the beginning of Book 12 concerning the destruction of the Achaean wall – a move that at first glance may seem paradoxical. This unique Homeric glimpse into the future occurs at the midpoint of the *Iliad* (12.9–33). The Achaean wall, around which the battle between Greeks and Trojans rages from Book 12–15, had been built in Book 7, despite Poseidon's displeasure. Touchy, as always, about his prerogatives, Poseidon there complained to Zeus that the Greeks built the wall without proper sacrifice to the gods, yet its fame will endure 'as far as the dawn is scattered' while the one that he and Apollo built will fall into oblivion (7.445–53). Zeus reassures Poseidon; he should not worry: *his* wall 'will endure as far as the dawn is scattered'. Accordingly, after the fall of Troy, the poet tells us, and the Greeks have departed, not only Poseidon, but also Apollo (the two gods on opposing sides in the war) and Zeus will join together in diverting the rivers of the Troad to blot out all traces of the wall along with the shields and helmets of the race of the demigods, the ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν (12.23) – the only time the term ἡμίθεοι is used in the epic. As the great epic reaches its midpoint, all signs of the Achaean wall on the Trojan plain will disappear. Nevertheless, the *kleos* of the wall will indeed abide – 'as far as the dawn is scattered' – through Homer's poetry. The wall as well as the marginalization of hero cult point in the same direction: the epic lays claim to and insists on its exclusive prerogative to confer *kleos aphthiton*, imperishable glory, upon its heroes, who must die to acquire it, a *kleos* that, like the epic itself, transcends the local character of traditional hero cult in order to achieve Panhellenic status.

The Homeric poet emphasizes the superiority of his medium to memorialize the heroic dead,[39] and he emphasizes the shortcomings of hero cult even within the context of Book 23 with its focus on the rituals meant to commemorate Patroklos and, by implication, the future rites for Achilles. Before the chariot race, Nestor indicates to

[39] On this passage, see Grethlein (n. 18), 169–72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his son Antilochus a σῆμα that will serve as the turning post: a piece of wood with two stones on either side (23.326–33); it is, he says easily discernible: the stones are white and the wood hard enough to be impervious to the weather. Nevertheless, Nestor can only guess whether it was once the tomb, the σῆμα, 'of a man who died long ago' or if it was used by earlier generations as a turning post (for funeral games?); in either case, the monument fails to commemorate; it ends up being a σῆμα with no meaning, consigned to anonymity. The anonymity of a mere physical object bolsters the claim that only the epic can bestow imperishable fame.[40]

Be that as it may, if Homeric epic did not invent hero cult, admittedly, it may nevertheless have played a role in the foundation, proliferation, and perhaps even the conduct of many geometric and archaic hero cults. Antonaccio summarizes:

> The final refutation of direct epic influence on burial practices must be seen in Toumba [Lefkandi] . . . On the other hand, Toumba strengthens the view that Homeric poetry, in its long period of evolution, picked up, preserved, and transformed fragments of culture and history from the Bronze Age to the Iron. Thus the 'Hero of Lefkandi' makes it possible to place epic poetry and funerary customs alike in their proper cultural framework and to grasp the unity of that culture and the logic of its development.[41]

Such cults were often localized at the grave and dedicated to epic heroes as well as to *oikists* (founders) and benefactors of various kinds. But many of the rituals appear to have a propitiatory function, often to appease the anger of the buried hero – and which hero above all others in the Greek tradition is characterized by his *menis*, his godlike anger, but Achilles?

We do know a fair amount about the historical worship of Achilles, now usefully summarized by Burgess.[42] The tumulus on the Hellespont that was thought to hold both the bones of Achilles and Patroklos in a golden urn was visited in historical times by Xerxes and the Persian army, Alexander, and later by Caracalla and the Emperor Julian; the

[40] Cf. L. F. Garcia, *Homeric Durability. Telling Time in the* Iliad (Washington, DC, 2013), 148–57, who discusses the impermanence of the heroic *sema*, but also doubts the permanence of *kleos* through poetry. See also Nagy (n. 34).

[41] Antonaccio (n. 26), 243.

[42] Burgess (n. 5), 111–34; see also G. M. Hedreen, 'The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine', *Hesperia* 60 (1991), 313–30. D. Burton, 'Immortal Achilles', *G&R* 63 (2016), 1–28, not only emphasizes the proliferation of locations where Achilles' cult is celebrated, but also differentiates his form of immortality from that of Heracles and the Dioscouri in that it is always tied to specific locations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

battle between the Athenians and the Lesbians of Mytilene, in which Alcaeus took part, was fought at a town named Achilleion, presumably at the site of the mound (Hdt. 5.94). Moreover, Philostratus' *Heroikos* (53.8) describes an annual pilgrimage to the site by Achilles' Thessalian compatriots. Most intriguing is the evidence that Achilles was not just venerated with a localized hero cult at the site of his tumulus, but also worshipped as a god at many other sites in the Greek world, and especially in the area of Olbia on the northern coast of the Black Sea. Archaeological evidence for the cult of Achilles Pontarches ('Ruler of the Sea') dates as far back as the second half of the sixth century BCE and continues through to the third century CE. This cult of a divine Achilles appears to derive from the story in the *Aethiopis* in which, after his death, his mother Thetis makes him immortal and settles him on the White Island, Leuce, which the Greeks who colonized the northern coast of the Black Sea identified with Berezan, ancient Borysthenes.

To be sure, the *Iliad* breathes not a word about Achilles' immortalization. This omission might be explained by assuming that the tradition of Achilles' divinity is post-Homeric.[43] Yet even if the poet of the *Iliad* was aware of a tradition of his hero's apotheosis, he would have avoided explicitly incorporating it into his composition. For the *Iliad*'s Achilles may be godlike in his strength, his beauty, and his *menis*, but he is not divine; the *Iliad,* and Iliadic heroism is predicated on human mortality. From its perspective, even Heracles died, and Sarpedon, Zeus's own son, cannot be rescued from death. For Homer, as we argued, immortality comes first and foremost from the epic itself, from the *kleos aphthiton* that it alone can confer. While, as we have seen, the epic may show an awareness of remembrance through cult, it nevertheless marginalizes that possibility. This paradoxical acknowledgement of hero cult and its simultaneous suppression in the interest of the self-aggrandizement of epic as the vehicle of heroic *kleos* is, I would argue, most manifest in the ritual activity surrounding Patroklos' funeral. The hero of the *Iliad* who most self-consciously chooses the imperishable glory that epic alone

[43] Burgess (n. 5) does not believe that a post-mortem existence of Achilles is post-Homeric or even contradicts the *Iliad*; rather, he argues that the *Iliad* presents but one of the various traditions concerning Achilles' death and afterlife. He also suggests that the difference between a hero and a divinity is not that great, but Homer certainly insists on the distinction. For other figures (especially Heracles) worshipped as both hero and god, see Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 98–100, and again Burton (n. 42).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

confers simultaneously alludes to his imperishable honour, *time aphthitos*, as a hero of cult.[44] The opposition between these two forms of remembrance is maintained, but also accommodated, as the *Iliad* draws to a close.

The actions of Achilles in carrying out Patroklos' funeral constitute a complex ritual which I have called a blueprint for a future cult that eternally links the two heroes in ritual. We cannot know if the rituals described in the epic were ever actually practised. But the audience of the *Iliad* would have recognized in the depiction of the sequence of actions a ritual performance whose elements were familiar to them from the conduct of hero cults; and they would have recognized that the ritual choreography surrounding Patroklos' funeral constituted a foundation or *aition*, the *legomena* (things said), for the *dromena* (things done, ritual actions) of a future cult of Achilles. The Homeric text allows us to reconstruct such a ritual activity, using both internal and historical evidence.

In what follows I will be relying on the work of Gunnel Ekroth, who has provided an exhaustive review of the literary and epigraphic evidence for hero cult.[45] Inevitably, her evidence spans the period of the archaic period up to 300 BCE and acknowledges some of the changes involving hero cult over that time period. Nevertheless, while phenomena such as the deification of rulers can have significant impact on religious practices, all in all rituals tend to be conservative. Another important facet of Ekroth's work is her attempt to distinguish hero cult from funeral rituals for the ancestors and the ordinary dead, which is relevant for my discussion here. Thus, with due caution I will be invoking some of her conclusions in the following discussion.

Now, ritual involves a specified sequence of actions by specified individuals at a specified time. The Iliadic text presents just such a recognizable sequence. First, after the Greek army has scattered to its various camps, Achilles orders his still-armed Myrmidons to mourn and to make a procession with their chariots three times around the body of Patroklos (23.4–14).[46] This is accompanied by ritual lamentation (*goos*), led by Achilles (τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης ἀδινοῦ ἐξῆρχε

[44] See Nagy (n. 34), 132–8, for *time aphthitos* from cult vs. *kleos aphthiton* from poetry.

[45] See Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22).

[46] For chariot processions found on Geometric vases depicting *prothesis* and *ekphora*, see Andronikos (n. 9), 43–51. A procession three times around the body of the deceased is also described in Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 1.1058–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

γόοιο, 'among them the Son of Peleus led off the lament,' 23.17), but there is already something slightly off here.[47] First, Achilles is the only non-female character to utter a formal lamentation. In his review of Iliadic laments, Tsagalis omits this passage despite its formulaic introduction as an epic *goos*, nor does he try to explain its anomalous character.[48] Achilles' lament neither praises his dead friend, nor expresses his sense of loss at his demise; he merely describes his revenge: first, his killing of Hector and then his contemplated slaughter of the Trojan youths on the pyre σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς ('angered on account of your death,' 23.23). Anger takes the place of lament; revenge takes the place of mourning.

Achilles then arranges for a feast for his Myrmidons: ὃ τοῖσι τάφον μενοεικέα δαίνυ ('for them he prepared an abundant funeral feast,' 23.29). Oxen, sheep, goats, and pigs are sacrificed; ἀμφὶ σιδήρῳ | σφαζόμενοι ('slaughtered around the iron [blade],' 30–1) emphasizes the throat cutting, and blood, we are told, flows around the corpse in cupfuls (23.29–34).[49] Here there appears to be an inversion of the usual order of funerary ritual: as a rule, the *Totenmahl* follows rather than precedes cremation (cf. 24.802, *Od.* 3.309).[50] The feasting here

[47] Cf. A. Kelly, 'Achilles in Control? Managing Oneself and Others in the Funeral Games', in P. Bassino, L.-G. Canevaro, and B. Graziosi (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry* (Cambridge, 2017), 90: Achilles 'utters formal lamentation himself three times for his friend (18.314–42, 19.314–39, 23.12–23. . .) and is the only male in the Homeric poems to "lead off" formal lamentation (cf. 18.51, 22.430, 24.723, 24.747, 24.761)'.

[48] C. C. Tsagalis, *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's* Iliad (Berlin/Boston, 2004), 171, n. 446: 'I do not consider Achilles' speech (23.19–23) a personal lament, because its structure and content does not fit the requirements we have set.' In fact, Tsagalis barely mentions Book 23.

[49] Does this mean merely that there was an abundance of blood or was the blood actually poured around the corpse as an offering, as seems to be the case in Pelops' cult in Olympia, which Pindar *Ol.* 1.90 calls αἱμακουρία? Cf. N. J. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. VI: Books 21–24* (Cambridge, 1993), ad loc.; Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 171–7.

[50] The scholia ad loc. were already troubled by the displacement. For the *Totenmahl*, see Andronikos (n. 9), 15–18, who also discusses the displacement of the *Totenmahl* in the case of Patroklos; he suggests, unconvincingly in my opinion, 'daß dem Dichter bei der Bestattung des Patraklos primitivere, rohere Sitten vorschwebten, die besser zu der kriegerischen Männergemeinschaft passen als die feinen Gebräuche der Familie Hektors' (p. 17: 'that in the case of Patroklos' burial the poet imagined more primitive, cruder customs, that are more appropriate to the warlike male community [of the Achaeans] than the refined manners of Hector's family'). This does not explain *Od.* 3.309 where Orestes throws a funeral feast for Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Edwards (n. 1), 87–8, also notes the unusual order of the funeral feast, but accounts for the inversion on pragmatic grounds – i.e. that the insertion of the banquet would have been awkward right before the funeral games. On the contrary: setting the funeral feast right before the games would have indicated the reintegration of Achilles with the community of the Greeks. M. Kitts, '"Bulls Cut Down Bellowing": Ritual Leitmotifs and Poetic Pressures in *Iliad* XXIII', *Kernos* 20 (2007), 17–41, unpersuasively argues that the funeral feast combines elements of commensal eating and oath sacrifice; but ὀρέχθεον 30 does not mean 'bellowing' but 'were stretched out,' now linked firmly with ὀρέγω (C. Le Feuvre 'Πολλοὶ μὲν βόες ἀργοὶ

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appears to be displaced from its normal sequence serves to bring an end to the period of mourning and not only signifies a return to the basic needs of the body, but also serves to reintegrate the mourners into the community of the living through a shared meal. The funeral of Hector that brings the *Iliad* to a close seems to follow the normal sequence in which the *Totenmahl* signals the end of the period of communal mourning.[51] The apparent displacement of the feast and some of the other unusual features may point us in another direction and reinforces my suggestion that we are here dealing with the features of hero cult. In short, what is described here is neither a *Totenmahl* nor even the rituals commemorating the ordinary dead by their relatives and families; instead, it resembles the *thysia* typical of hero cult. As Ekroth has demonstrated, the *thysia* for heroes does not differ from normal sacrifices to Olympian divinities; it involves animal sacrifices and dining on the sacrificial meats.[52] Animal sacrifice as well as *enagismata* (holocausts) involving blood rituals for the non-heroic dead are, according to Ekroth, exceedingly rare.[53] In our passage, the emphasis on bloodletting and the pouring of cupfuls of blood over the corpse of Patroklos is unprecedented. Even in hero cult, special treatment of sacrificial blood is unusual and may, according to Ekroth, relate either to war, where blood sacrifices were common, or as a means of establishing communication with the dead.[54] Both aspects are clearly relevant to the context of Patroklos' funeral, and it is striking

ὀρέχθεον / ἐρέχθεον / ῥόχθεον: Que lisaient les auteurs classique en *Il.* 23.30?' *RPh* 85 (2011), 267–82).

[51] It is worth noting that Hector's funerary feast takes place in Priam's palace and not in the vicinity of the deceased or the funeral pyre. The dining in Book 7.466–77 of Greeks and Trojans also takes place after the cremations of the corpses, although in the case of the Greeks it comes after the wall is built, but the Trojans' feasting would seem to follow right after the cremation and hence be considered a *Totenmahl*; it too takes place in the city and not in the vicinity of the cremation (23.477; cf. 429).

[52] It also appears that the cultic *thysia* generally preceded other forms of worship: singing, dancing, and games; we might think that it opens the ritual rather than bringing it to an end as does the funerary feast.

[53] Cf. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 228–32. In fact, as Ekroth (p. 228) notes, 'the main evidence for this view [that modern scholars have often assumed that animal sacrifice, including the destruction of the victim used to form part of the rituals at the burial and the cult of the dead] is the Homeric epics and, in particular, the description of the funeral of Patroklos in the *Iliad*'.

[54] Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 242–58, points to the importance of blood in sacrifices involving war as well as the use of blood to attract the dead in the *Nekuia*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the ghost of the hero appears to Achilles shortly thereafter (23.65–107).

I have dwelt at some length on the lines describing the feast Achilles arranges for his men because I believe it reveals that we are not dealing with ordinary funeral practice, but already points in the direction of hero cult, the joint cult Achilles is here establishing for himself and Patroklos. Another topic that (re)emerges at the beginning of Book 23 is the theme of eating, which had previously surfaced in Book 19 where Achilles' impatience to fight is rebuffed by Odysseus who insists on the army's need for sustenance before joining battle. Achilles, however, has vowed not to eat until he has avenged Patroklos; there, his departure from normal human necessities was underlined by his being nourished on ambrosia and nectar (19.352–4). Here, the return of the role of eating signals its importance throughout the last books of the *Iliad*. At 23.29 while Achilles plays the host for the feast, whether he partakes or not is left unclear. Scholars have debated whether Achilles eats or continues to fast throughout Book 23, but the important point is that the poet does not *show* us Achilles eating until he shares a meal with Priam at 24.618–28.

At any rate, shortly after the sacrificial feast for the Myrmidons, Achilles is summoned to a feast at Agamemnon's encampment, where, despite the urgings of the *basileis Achaion*, he refuses to bathe, claiming that it is *ou themis* ('not ritually correct') for him to wash – but indeed a ritual custom that he is now establishing.[55] Pollution, to be sure, arises from contact with the dead, but I suggest Achilles' continued state of pollution has a cultic dimension; as Parker notes, Achilles 'speaks of this refusal to wash as a religious obligation.'[56] This may also be related to hero cult; to quote Parker again, 'the cult of heroes was celebrated at their tombs; the participants were sometimes required to purify themselves afterwards'.[57] Washing, at the very least the hands, is a ritual prerequisite before eating as the

[55] Cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 207 where Demeter claims that it is οὐ θεμιτόν for her to drink wine; at the same time, she inaugurates a hallmark of Eleusinian ritual: the *kukeon*. For the semantics of *(ou) themis*, see, most recently, S. Peels-Matthey, '(Οὐχ) ὅσιος vs. (οὐ) θέμις: A Comparative Analysis', in V. M. Ramón Palerm and A. C. Vicente Sánchez (eds.), *ASEBEIA Estudios sobre la irreligiosidad en Grecia. Studies in Greek Irreligiosity* (Madrid, 2020), 111–25. In inscriptions, *ou themis* indicates what is ritually impure or prohibited. On the symbolism of the bath that unites Achilles, Patroklos, and Hector, see J. Grethlein, 'The Poetics of the Bath in the *Iliad*', *HSCPh* 103 (2007), 25–49.

[56] R. C. T. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983), 68.

[57] Parker (n. 56), 39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many scenes of Homeric banqueting attest. The refusal to wash before eating renders Achilles somehow subhuman, like an animal; Achilles has not rinsed off the gore of battle and remains polluted by the blood of Hector; washing constitutes the necessary prelude to feasting. But finally, Achilles 'gives in to the hateful feast'[58] (ἀλλ' ἤτοι νῦν μὲν στυγερῇ πειθώμεθα δαιτί, 23.48). The *dais* that implies equality and *philia* has become loathsome, στυγερή.[59] Achilles declares the particularly human institution which unites its participants hateful and thereby distances himself from human society. Aristotle might call him *apolis,* floundering in the interstices between god and beast. The *dais* among the chieftains was intended to reintegrate Achilles into the community; it does not succeed. Homer indicates as much when, forgoing the usual formulas for communal feasting, he tells us: 'preparing their meal in haste, each of them feasted' (ἐσσυμένως δ' ἄρα δόρπον ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἕκαστοι δαίνυντ(ο), 23.55–6);[60] the proprieties that characterize a shared feast are omitted. It is merely a meal. Achilles is here inaugurating a period of ritual impurity which cannot be ended – until Patroklos is cremated, and Achilles has cut his hair.[61] Here again we cannot be sure whether Achilles eats or continues his fast.[62]

Achilles now orders Agamemnon to arrange for the Greeks (but apparently not the Myrmidons) to gather wood and whatever else is necessary for the funeral pyre. Achilles returns and spends the night

[58] This also cannot be a proper funeral feast but is instead intended to mark Achilles' social reconciliation with the army chieftains, especially Agamemnon. But it too remains unfulfilled; Achilles' polluted state forbids a full integration, and he remains outside the human institutions of commensality. Cf. Grethlein (n. 20), esp. 258, n. 6.

[59] At 24.41–5, Apollo describes Achilles' continued mutilation of Hector's body with the oxymoronic simile of a *dais* of a lion.

[60] ἕκαστοι would seem to undermine the communal aspect of a genuine feast, as does the hurried preparation. The scholia cite *Od.* 1.424 as a parallel, where each of the Suitors goes off separately to sleep.

[61] Parker (n. 56), 66, claims that 'in Homer, there is no hint of *miasma* affecting the living', but he concedes that '[t]here is in fact a connection between death and dirt in Homer, although it may not be justified to speak of pollution in the classical sense (67)'. Subsequently, he is more cautious: 'the evidence . . . shows at least that the symbolism of pollution was already linked to death in Homer, even if it lacked the metaphysical extension it was later to receive' (p. 69). If *ou themis* indicates a religious prohibition, then Achilles' refusal to wash does not simply refer to physical dirt. At 6.267 Hector rejects the idea of pouring a libation to Zeus with unwashed hands, and Achilles himself at 16.230 carefully cleanses the chalice and washes his hands before offering a libation to Zeus. Are Achilles' hands still unwashed when he prays to the Winds at 23.197?

[62] When Priam finds Achilles eating in Book 24.473–6, he is apparently eating alone. If so, it is not a *dais*. It is merely *edode*! C. McLeod, *Homer: Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge, 1982), 100, thinks Achilles does not eat at 24.2–3 nor at 24.123–30; in the latter passage, Thetis admonishes her son for 'eating his heart' rather than normal eating.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mourning on the beach with his Myrmidons. Accusing him of neglect, Patroklos' ghost – perhaps attracted by the abundant blood – appears to him and begs to be cremated after which he will not return (23.65–105). Prophesying Achilles' imminent death, he insists that they be together in death as they were in life and that their bones be joined in the golden amphora Achilles received from his mother (23.59–92). Attempting in vain to embrace his friend, a stunned Achilles proclaims: 'There is something even in the house of Hades, a breath (*psyche*) and a shade (*eidolon*), but the *phrenes* are not entirely there' (23.103–4).[63]

The next day, the Greeks gather wood for the pyre whose place Achilles indicates will form the mound for both Patroklos and himself (23.126). In the meantime, Achilles has his Myrmidons arm and again make a carefully choreographed procession carrying Patroklos to the pyre (*ekphora*); the horsemen and chariots precede the corpse, and the foot soldiers follow behind with the bier in the middle where Achilles holds Patroklos' head, as we have seen, a maternal gesture of mourning.[64] All the Myrmidons then cut their hair and place it on the body, but Achilles, who had once promised to offer his hair to the river Sperchios if he returned home safely, puts his hair in Patroklos' hands (23.140–53).[65] Achilles knows his fate is sealed; he will never return home. The poet has here taken two types of hair-cutting ritual, an offering for *kourotrophia* and the gesture of mourning, and conflated the two.[66] This duality, combining a rite of passage and mourning, seems, I suggest, particularly characteristic

[63] Exactly what this means is not clear, but in the *Odyssey* (10.493–4), Circe tells Odysseus that Teiresias' *phrenes* are firm, unfailing (ἔμπεδος), and that 'even in death' Persephone granted him *noos*'. οὐ πάμπαν means 'not entirely' rather than 'not at all': see M. L. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden, 1964), 1.540–2.

[64] On more than one occasion, Achilles has cast himself in a maternal role: as a mother bird who feeds her chicks rather than tending to herself (9.323–7), and when he chides Patroklos (16.7–11) for weeping like a child who runs to his mother. As mourner, he takes up the female role (see n. 47).

[65] On hair-cutting in funerary contexts, see Andronikos (n. 9), 18–20.

[66] Cf. D. Leitao, 'Adolescent Hair-cutting Rituals in Ancient Greece: a Sociological Approach', in D. Dodd and C. Faraone (eds.), *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives* (London, 2003), 109–29 and *Od.* 4.197–8, 24.46; perhaps imitated by Aeschylus *Cho.* 607. I. and A. Petrovic have pointed out to me *per litteras* that 'the conflation of the two rituals (mourning and a rite of passage) becomes a characteristic motif in funerary poetry (especially for those who have died prematurely and leave grief . . . instead of expected cheer and bridal song – Phrasikleia is an example.' Death, to be sure, is a rite of passage, and all the Iliadic warriors – but none more so than Achilles παναώριος (24.540) – meet premature deaths. This I have always taken to be the meaning of **προ**ίαψεν in *Il.* 1.3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the whole ceremony; it is also attested in hero cult; in the cult for Hippolytus both hair-cutting and mourning by brides (another rite of passage?) is attested (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1423–30; Paus. 2.32.1).

Achilles now abruptly orders Agamemnon to send off the rest of the Greek army to have their dinner (23.158)[67] – striking in view of his own fasting – so that those who were closest to the dead man may attend to the cremation itself (23.154–83). This involves a holocaust of sheep and cattle, whose fat is used to cover the corpse, along with the placement of amphoras of honey and oil around the pyre. Four horses and two of Patroklos' dogs as well as, most scandalously, twelve Trojan youths are slaughtered and burned.[68] Sacrificial horses and dogs are attested in other post-Homeric burials and also have been found at Lefkandi.[69] The killing and cremation of the youths may be ascribed to heroic amplification, although the mound at Lefkandi was even larger than Patroklos' 100-foot pyre. But again, at least in the historical record, holocausts did not seem to play a role in the cults of the ordinary dead.[70] An unusual feature of Patroklos' cremation may also be the use of fat to cover the body, for if there were no sacrificial animals in normal funeral rites, there would also not be any available fat. But fat plays an important role in *thysia* sacrifice where, ever since Prometheus, it covers the bones to be burned and dedicated to the gods. It is tempting to think that the fat surrounding the bones of Patroklos, like other aspects of his funerary rituals, alludes to a connection to hero cult.

At this climactic moment, the ceremony is interrupted; when the funeral pyre does not ignite, Achilles prays to the winds, and Iris flies

[67] Throughout the rites for Patroklos, as indeed throughout Book 23, Achilles is clearly in charge, as is attested by his giving orders to Agamemnon (cf. 23.49–53, 110–12, 155–62). C. Ulf, '*Ilias* 23: Die Bestattung des Patroklos und das Sportfest der "Patroklos- Spiele": Zwei Teile einer *mirror-story*', in H. Heftner and K. Tomaschitz (eds.), *Ad Fontes! Festschrift Gerhard Dobesch* (Vienna, 2004), 73–86, on the other hand, sees Book 23 as depicting the progressive reconciliation of Achilles with Agamemnon. He also argues that Agamemnon and the other chiefs remain during the cremation ceremony, but at 23.155 Agamemnon and the rest of the army are sent away only to return at 23.233; the division remains.

[68] D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991), 49–70, argues that the killing of the twelve young Trojans should be considered neither a sacrifice nor does it involve giving the dead an accompaniment, but is rather to be viewed as a ritual of revenge. It clearly meets with the poet's disapproval, *pace* S. E. Bassett, 'Achilles' Treatment of Hector's Body', *TAPhA* 64 (1933), 41–65. The sacrifice of Polyxena at Achilles' funeral can be viewed as a counterpart to the slaughter of the Trojan youths; both attest to Achilles' thirst for revenge, even after his own death.

[69] Especially Salamis and Eretria; cf. Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors* (n. 26), 223–43.

[70] Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 228–34.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

off to their cave where the winds are enjoying their feast, and summons their help. The winds arrive and blow on the fire, so it finally burns (23.192–216). This scene is puzzling; whether it has any ritual counterpart remains obscure, but here too Neoanalysis attempted to account for its presence. Kakridis, among others, argued that the scene was imported from the *Aethiopis* where the winds, as brothers of Memnon, Dawn's son, at first refused to light the pyre of Achilles.[71] Unfortunately, as Kelly points out, while perhaps *ben trovato*, there is no evidence for such an episode.[72] The scene and its tone remain puzzling. It has been suggested that this interruption lends dignity to the proceedings (which I do not see), or that it gives relief, even comic relief, from the emotional intensity of the actions that culminate in the horrendous slaughter of the Trojan youths; Richardson comments on the episode's 'almost baroque quality'.[73] To be sure, the winds' carousing in their distant cave along with their slightly *louche* invitation to Iris – who is in a hurry to join the other gods to feast with the Aethiopians – contrasts mightily with the violence, the gore, and the unrestrained mourning on the shores of Troy. The juxtaposition here of the gods 'who live easy' with humanity's mortal sorrow is reminiscent of the scene at the end of *Iliad* I where the gods' feasting, laughter, and song on Olympus contrast with the catastrophic consequences of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles just unleashed on the Trojan plain. Are we then to see the gods as remote and indifferent to human suffering? Yet just before this, Aphrodite and Apollo have intervened to preserve the body of Hector (23.184–91); and later Apollo will protest Achilles' inhuman actions (24.18–21) and again protect the corpse (24.418–23). I suggest, very tentatively, that the Olympians' involvement with human norms and their transgression which unleashes *menis* is here juxtaposed with another, but still divine, order, the elemental order of nature – here personified by the winds – that remains indifferent to human life, its mortality, and suffering.

The funeral pyre burns all night after which Achilles pours libations of wine over it. At dawn, the rest of the Greeks return, and Achilles orders them again to pour libations on the pyre as well as to collect the bones of Patroklos; these are to be covered with a layer of fat –

[71] Kakridis (n. 3), 75–83
[72] A. Kelly, *Homer*, Iliad *Book 23* (Cambridge, forthcoming), ad loc.
[73] Richardson (n. 49), ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

another Promethean touch? – and stored in a golden *phiale* until Achilles' own death when their bones will be intermingled and sealed in the tumulus.[74] The tomb and the *sema* likewise are not to be completed until Achilles joins his friend. At this point, Achilles rather abruptly detains the army as it begins to scatter (23.257), announcing the funeral games – unexpectedly, I might add, for they are anomalous for Patroklos, but fully appropriate to the status of a hero like Achilles.

I hope this summary has not been too lengthy, but I believe it constitutes the aetiology for the performance of the future cult envisaged by the *Iliad*. The entire funeral has taken three days and two nights; it apparently involves both *thysia* sacrifice (23.29–33) and holocausts (23.170–7).[75] It also features a reversal of normal human activities: the refusal to bathe and ritual impurity, fasting, a hair offering, not sleeping, and solitary eating. It also includes a procession in armour around the tumulus, accompanied by ritual lamentation, feasting before rather than after cremation,[76] a second procession and a second night of mourning with a sacrificial holocaust at the pyre and libations. Perhaps also of cultic significance is the alternation of ritual actions between the entire Greek army and the smaller contingent of the Myrmidons alone; possibly, the latter should be considered to stand in for the closer relatives of the dead man. But if the cutting of hair is not only a sign of mourning, but also a rite of passage between youth and adulthood, then perhaps the division of participants may be based on age groups, with the Myrmidons, like Achilles, representing ephebes.[77]

We do not know that an actual cult on the Hellespont followed the scenario outlined in the *Iliad*. More generally, the basic components – mourning, feasting, ritual impurity, hair offering, holocausts including horses and dogs, libations of wine, and funeral games – can be

[74] A. Petropoulou, 'The Internment of Patroklos (*Iliad* 23.252–57)', *AJPh* 109 (1988), 482–95, suggests that the *phiale* is buried rather than removed to Achilles' tent.

[75] Cf. Ekroth , *The Sacrificial Rituals* (n. 22), 99, who notes that Achilles is the closest parallel to Heracles, who was worshipped both as a hero and a god and received both *thysia* and *enagismata*, with the latter celebrating their more mortal aspects.

[76] Cf. Richardson (n. 49), 166–7.

[77] In what appears to be an initiatory ritual, as Pausanias (3.30.83–6) relates, Spartan boys who were about to engage in some sort of ritual combat at Platanistas sacrificed to Achilles at his shrine. I. and A. Petrovic have drawn my attention to a ritual, attested later, linking ephebes with hero cult. Athenian ephebes were required to visit the sanctuary of Amphiaraos in Oropos (IG II/2 1006, 25–6) and 'they visited other rural sanctuaries and sacrificed on behalf of the people. When they arrived at the grave at Marathon, they offered a wreath and a sacrifice to those who died in war for freedom.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

paralleled in historically attested hero cults. And, as so often in such aetiologies, the myths behind the cult provide a version that will be considerably watered down in actual practice, in the *dromena* as opposed to the *legomena,* i.e., no human sacrifice, of which the poet makes clear his disapproval. Philostratus, however, confirms one detail: in describing the annual rites of the Thessalians at Achilles' tomb, he emphasizes that the hero receives both *thysia* sacrifice *and* holocaust (*Her.* 53.8–9): this combination is not unparalleled and of course well suited to Achilles who was worshipped both as a hero and a god.[78] In Philostratus, Achilles is also characterized by his angry and punitive nature, his continuing *menis oulomene*. This points to an additional anomalous feature of Patroklos' funeral. As already mentioned, Achilles' mourning focuses not on his dead friend and the customary praise of Patroklos' outstanding qualities, but rather on Achilles' own desire for revenge, a desire that will only be assuaged after he breaks bread with Priam. This omission points to the incompleteness, the lack of closure at the end of the funeral rites, even after the necessary rituals, including the games, have been carried out.

And this brings me to an element of funerary ritual, which is significantly absent from the Iliadic description: the ritual *goos* by women.[79] Such a *goos* by Hecuba, Andromache, and Helen precedes the cremation of Hector. One could argue that the lament for Patroklos by women, above all, by Briseis, has occurred previously in Book 19. But even so, its absence from the ceremony itself is remarkable, and it is striking that the formulaic line usually introducing *women's* lament is used of Achilles himself at the beginning of Book 23 (17). Anomalous, too, as we have seen, is Achilles' refusal to bathe and his continued refusal to participate fully in the rituals of commensality. The omission of reconciliation, of reintegration, of a return to the living, is not fulfilled in the course of Book 23, as is clear from Achilles unrelenting mistreatment of Hector's corpse at the opening of Book 24. Even after the encounter with Priam and the return of Hector's body, a sense of incompleteness abides. It and the full *threnos* ('lament') for Achilles can only be accomplished with the death of the hero, foreshadowed but not depicted in the poem, but somehow

[78] Cf. n. 75.

[79] Another notice in Pausanias (6.23.3) describes the women of Elis, who at the beginning of a festival at the cenotaph of the hero 'do various things to honor Achilles and are accustomed to beat their breasts in mourning'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proleptically enacted through the funeral of Patroklos that envisages their joined cult.

As we have seen, many other events in Book 23 allude to subsequent episodes in the heroic tradition. Thus, the strands that emanate from Book 23 form part of a larger whole. By pointing both forward and backward and incorporating events both prior and subsequent to its own narrative, the *Iliad* itself manages to present indirectly but comprehensively the whole story of the Trojan War. The Wrath of Achilles simultaneously encompasses not only the entire Trojan War, but also an even larger tradition and vision that recognizes the war at Troy as a world historical event that signals the demise of those half-gods whom we call heroes:[80] half-gods because they sprang from the gods, half-gods because of their intimacy with the gods.

The *Odyssey* already looks back at the Age of Heroes as part of a vanished era. The *Cypria*, another lost cyclic poem that recounted events preceding our *Iliad*, began from a plan of Zeus. One of the first steps to its realization took place at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, the union that all the gods attended, which produced Achilles. It is no accident that this wedding is alluded to only once in the Homeric poems, at the end of the *Iliad* (24.61–2). So too the Judgment of Paris that precipitates the war (24.28–30). Thus, the end of the *Iliad* looks back to the ultimate cause of the war while its middle (the passage about the Achaean wall) points, as we have seen, forward to its consequences. Nor is it fortuitous that the very end of the *Odyssey* gives an elaborate description of what was foreshadowed, but already present in *Iliad* 23: the death and funeral of Achilles (*Od.* 24.36–92). There, Thetis with her Nereids and the Muses intone a *threnos* in honour of the hero. It is as if the full ritual cannot take place until the hero's vow is fulfilled, and Achilles has joined Patroklos in death. The *Odyssey* also recounts how Thetis brings to the funeral the golden urn, already mentioned at 23.92, that will contain the mingled bones of the two inseparable heroes. We learn that it was the work of Hephaestos and the gift of Dionysos. That both these divinities were rescued by Thetis enhances the pathos of her inability to rescue her mortal son. And the Greek army that participates in the rites that honour the hero here – and here alone in

[80] For the demise of the heroes as a background to the *Iliad*, see J. Strauss Clay, 'The Whip and Will of Zeus', *Literary Imagination* 1 (1999), 40–60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Homeric poems – is called a ἱερὸς στρατός (*Od.* 24.81).[81] The omitted dirge can finally be sung, and, if we feel bold, we can surmise its contents: the Muses' *threnos* for Achilles and his comrade is none other than the monumental *Iliad* itself.

Afterword

The thematic unity of the narrative that takes its beginning from the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and closes with the funeral of Patroklos, which simultaneously adumbrates the rites for Achilles, was grasped not only by Homer but also by a certain Kleitias who decorated the François Vase. Like Homer, Kleitias attempted to provide a comprehensive visual account that spans the entire heroic age. The main frieze depicts the procession of the gods on their way to celebrate the wedding of Peleus and Thetis; and at its centre, reeling under the weight of a huge amphora that breaks out from its frame – to be identified, *ni fallor*, with the golden urn destined to contain the ashes of Achilles and Patroklos[82] – is Dionysos staring out at us and meeting our gaze.

JENNY STRAUSS CLAY

University of Virginia, USA

jsc2t@virginia.edu

[81] Here I believe the religious sense is foremost; the army is engaged in a religious ritual, inaugurating what I have argued is a cult in the company of Achilles' divine mother and the Muses. A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey, *vol. III: Books XVII–XXIV* (Oxford, 1992), ad loc., however, claims that ἱερός 'has lost some of its original, religious meaning, but not all the religious connotations: "filled with unusual strength"'. P. Wülfing-v. Martitz, 'Ἱερός bei Homer', *Glotta* 38 (1960), 301, is not very informative; and K. F. Ameis, C. Hentze, and P. Cauer (eds.), *Homer's Ilias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, seventh edition (Lipsiae, 1913), ad loc. interpret ἱερός as 'rüstig' ('sprightly'). But why would the army be sprightly at a funeral?

[82] A. Rumpf, 'Review of Beazley *The Development of Attic Black-figure*', *Gnomon* 25 (1953), 467–71, interpreted of the figure of Dionysos and his amphora on the François Vase as the golden amphora that will hold the bones of Achilles and Patroklos; and A. Stewart, 'Stesichoros and the François Vase', in W. Moon (ed.), *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, 1983), 53–74, argued for the possible influence of Stesichorus; but cf. *contra* G. Schaus, 'Gold or Clay? Dionysos' Amphora on the François Vase', *EMC* 30 (1986), 119–28; T. H. Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art* (Oxford, 1986), 7, 10–11; C. Isler-Kerényi, 'Dionysos im Götterzug bei Sophilos und be Kleitias: Dionysische Ikonographie 6', *AK* 40 (1997), 67–81. Cf. C. Dué, 'Achilles' Golden Amphora in Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* and the Afterlife of Oral Tradition', *CPh* 96 (2001), 33–47, and M. W. Haslam, 'Kleitias, Stesichoros and the Jar of Dionysos', *TAPhA* 121 (1991), 35–45, for textual issues.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383524000196 Published online by Cambridge University Press