

ΟΙ ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΟΙ ΉΡΩΕΣ: A STUDY OF HOMERIC HEROISM

ΟΙ ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΟΙ ἩΡΩΕΣ: A STUDY OF HOMERIC HEROISM

BY JAMES BADER, B.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree Masters of Classics

McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS (2021) Hamilton, Ontario (Classics)

ΟΙ ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΟΙ ἩΡΩΕΣ: A Study of Homeric Heroism. AUTHOR: James Bader,

B.A. (McMaster University) SUPERVISOR: Professor K. Mattison NUMBER OF

PAGES: v, 107

LAY ABSTRACT: This thesis investigates how the foundational value of connection underlies all forms of heroism within the Homeric epics. It argues that the traditional values of honour and shame that inform heroic choices require the framework of connection to operate upon. Homer takes the foundational value of connection, and the secondary values of honour and shame and presents many forms of both complicated and uncomplicated heroism across two distinct mediums. I lay out the many varying forms of heroism through an examination of the various characters that embody them. There is a specific focus on the character of Odysseus as he operates within Iliadic heroism in the *Iliad* as well as he redefines heroism through his journey in the *Odyssey*, creating the form of Odyssean heroism.

ABSTRACT: This thesis investigates how the foundational value of connection underlies all forms of heroism within the Homeric epics. It argues that the traditional values of honour and shame that inform heroic choices require the framework of connection to operate upon. Homer takes the foundational value of connection, and the secondary values of honour and shame and presents many forms of both complicated and uncomplicated heroism across two distinct mediums. The *Iliad* presents the reader with a variety of Iliadic heroes who operate within the medium of the battlefield, including Ajax as the uncomplicated form of Iliadic heroism and Achilles and Hektor as complicated forms of this heroism. The *Odyssey* showcases the evolution of Homeric heroism from the medium of the battlefield to the medium of the *nostos*, with Odysseus' evolution across the poem paralleling the evolution of Homeric heroism. The foundational value of connection is what allows the values of honour/shame to have significance in Homeric society, and therefore by engaging with connection and then the honor/shame matrix, a hero was able to gain *time* which upon his death was converted into *kleos* by his connections. Odysseus serves as the focal point for multiple types of heroism as his characterization in the *Iliad*, while he operates within the parameters of the Iliadic hero, is proleptic of his evolution into the Odyssean hero in the *Odyssey*.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

Chapter 1: The Iliadic Hero15

Chapter 2: Iliadic Odysseus44

Chapter 3: The Odyssean Hero68

Conclusion107

Bibliography114

Introduction

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* present to the reader multiple, oftentimes conflicting, notions of heroism. The poems present what one may initially interpret as a stable and unwavering code of heroism that is applicable to the multitudes of heroes spanning these epics. However, through an examination of the traits and the values within the Homeric warrior society, we find that a single “heroic code” or a “heroic form” cannot be portrayed in a clear-cut manner. I will use the character of Odysseus in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to discuss the different kinds of heroism. The characterization of Odysseus showcases the importance of connection, which is the foundational value of all Homeric heroism. Further, by looking at heroism through the characterization of Odysseus we can see how Homer establishes a paradigm of heroism, and how they¹ proceed to complicate that paradigm. The evolution of Odysseus as a hero between these two poems is representative of the evolution of the form of heroism in Homeric society, and this thesis will examine the many forms of heroism that the poems present. Before I turn to my insight and analysis of this subject, I must first address two key points: the omnipresent Homeric question that any Homeric scholar must address, and the chronology of these two poems and their subsequent relationship to one another.

Firstly, one is unable to comment upon the Homeric epics without discussing the Homeric question. These poems, while they reveal much about their own environment and mode of composition, give no indication as to the identity of a potential author.²

¹ For an explanation of the use of the pronoun “they” for Homer see footnote number 7 on page 2.

² Kirk, 1985. pg. 5

There have been multiple schools of thought regarding the nature of the poet(s). Milman Parry's discovery that the formulaic nature of the poems was part of a system that must be explained as an aid to oral composition in performance,³ alongside the fact that the poems had to be the creation of a tradition not a singular bard of outstanding nature, allowed for a dominating theory to emerge surrounding this issue.⁴ The stance that I support is the same one as laid out by Robert Fowler. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* appear to have been conceived as new kinds of texts by their oral poet(s) and we are unable to say with any certainty whether this was one poet or multiple.⁵ I am however inclined to lean towards the scholars who, as summarized by West, think that these poems were composed by multiple authors due to "the main differences of narrative manner, theogony, ethics, vocabulary, geographical perspective, and [to] the apparently imitative character of certain passages of the *Odyssey* in relation to the *Iliad*."⁶ Therefore, when referring to the poet or Homer throughout this discussion of heroism I do so with these considerations in mind.⁷

³ For more on the *Iliad* as a performance, and an investigation into how the "speaking culture" is foregrounded in the words of the poems heroic speakers see Martin (1989). For more on the *Iliad's* poetic discourse in terms of spoken discourse or speech see Bakker, (1997).

⁴ Fowler, 2004. pg. 221; Huebeck, 1998. pg. 8. For a broader study on how these poems were created, and how we understand Homer see Graziosi and Haubold, 2005 for their work on "resonance" in epic and Foley, J. 1999 for his discussion of traditional referentiality, which are beyond the scope of this thesis.

⁵ Fowler, 2004. pg. 230

⁶ West, 1999. pg. 364. For a comprehensive look into the speech acts within Homer and the impact they have on the formulaic nature of the epics see Minchin, 2007.

⁷ Throughout this thesis I have made the decision to utilize the pronoun "they" for Homer. As Homer is likely not a singular individual of any specific gender, it seems fitting to utilize the pronoun "they" when referring to the poet(s) who composed the Epic Poems. This pronoun conveys the ambiguities that have arisen from the Homeric question and allows me to remind the reader of the nature of Homer the poet as I discuss above.

The second consideration I must address before beginning my discussion on heroism in earnest is the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. I must establish my viewpoint on how these poems relate chronologically to one another, as my discussion of a potential evolution of the notion of heroism is contingent on a specific chronological order. The general consensus among the scholarship is that the *Odyssey* was written at a later date than the *Iliad*. G.S. Kirk in the Cambridge Commentary on the *Iliad* (1985) postulates that the *Odyssey* was written within approximately a generation of the composition of the *Iliad*.⁸ This claim is supported by Heubeck in the *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (1998) where they state definitively that the *Odyssey* is the later of these two epic poems.⁹ In terms of content the *Odyssey* appears to systematically suppress anything that is potential Iliadic within it, further supporting the notion that the *Odyssey* was created later.¹⁰ Since an in-depth investigation into the composition and dating of these poems is beyond the scope of this paper, I will be relying upon these conclusions. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis I will be operating under the assumption that the *Iliad* was composed first, and the *Odyssey* was composed second.¹¹

Having outlined the parameters of my study, in terms of the poetry itself, I now turn my attention to the conceptualization of heroism. Achilles is shown as the prototypical male warrior in Homer's *Iliad*, as he serves as the "best of the Achaeans"

⁸ Kirk, 1985. pg. 10

⁹ Heubeck, 1998. pg. 7

¹⁰ Nagy, 1979. pg. 21.

¹¹ For more on the chronology of the Homeric Epics see Rutherford, 2001. The Epic Cycle also deals with the material surrounding the Trojan War, yet the non-Homeric poems of the Epic Cycle will not be discussed in this thesis. This thesis is mainly concerned with the characterization and character development of the heroes, and the plot heavy poems of the Epic Cycle would add little to a study of this nature. For more on the Epic Cycle and how the Homeric poems fit within it see Burgess, 2001.

besieging the city of Troy.¹² However, in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Homer presents the reader with a multitude of “heroic” figures who, while all ascribing to the same foundational value of heroism¹³, seek to obtain *kleos* through different mediums, and due to this they engage with a matrix of secondary values. Therefore, before we can study Odysseus, and how he aids the evolution of heroism, we must first establish what we mean when we refer to the term “hero” in the *Iliad*, and which value (or values) within the matrix of Homeric society are considered foundational to all heroes.

In Chapter 1 a thorough examination of the *Iliad* will present many versions of Iliadic heroism. My discussion will begin with Ajax, as we will see through his characterization the uncomplicated Iliadic heroic code is established. Iliadic heroism revolves around the notions of *time* and *kleos*, which are gained through the context of warfare and are predicated on risking one’s life in physical combat. I will then turn to examine the characters in the *Iliad* that complicate this form of heroism. Achilles will serve as the primary example, as his reversion to the foundational value of heroism has him turn his back on the values that define Iliadic heroism. I approach the Achaean heroes like this because even though Achilles is the dominant character of the *Iliad* and

¹² Nagy, 1979. pg. 26 takes the Greek epithet “the best of the Achaeans” straight from the poetry itself, and applies it to both Achilles, and Odysseus, while he also details how Agamemnon, Diomedes, and Ajax attempt to lay claim to this title at various points within the poem. The qualification for being “the best of the Achaeans” appears to be intrinsically linked to the medium the hero is operating in. Achilles earns this title in the *Iliad* for being the best warrior, and both Diomedes and Ajax gain this epithet when they showcase their prowess on the battlefield. Odysseus is given this epithet in the *Odyssey*, and he receives this for not any actions displayed in the *Iliad* but for actions he displays in the *Odyssey* itself (Nagy, 1979. pg.40). The qualifications for the epithet “best of the Achaeans” remains consistent throughout both Homeric poems and Nagy lays out a very detailed examination of this epithet. See Nagy, 1979. Ch 2 for his whole investigation regarding this epithet.

¹³ The foundational value of all Homeric heroism as I will conceptualize it is connection. I go into detail concerning connection as the foundational value on page 5 and 6.

Ajax serves as a supporting character, nevertheless the characterization of Ajax is the one that holds the essence of uncomplicated heroism within the *Iliad*. Ajax will serve as the paradigm that Achilles is initially a part of before he redefines it to suit himself. I will also discuss Hektor as he functions as a mirror image to Achilles who, instead of severing his interpersonal connections for the sake of *time* and *kleos*, relies upon them to achieve his *kleos*.

Hektor in turn serves as a bridge into Chapter 2 which is a discussion on Odysseus as a unique hero in the *Iliad*. He is unique in his ability to recognize the context he is within, and he is unique in how adaptable his heroism is. I will show how Odysseus recognizes the medium he is operating in and how this allows him to engage with Iliadic heroism. I will then lay out how Odysseus is set apart from the other Iliadic heroes as a figure of *metis* rather than *bie*. Finally, I will discuss how as a hero in the *Iliad* Odysseus is more concerned with the foundational value of connection than the other heroes, and how the poem consistently showcases his prioritization of connections when other heroes do not.

The third and final chapter will then proceed to establish the final heroic form which is Odyssean heroism. This is the form of the familial hero. This concept of heroism still entails the foundational value and the honour/shame matrix that we have laid out as the foundation of all Homeric heroism, but rather than engaging with these through the medium of war, the poet shows how they can be sought in a time of peace. The medium for achievement now becomes the survival of a *nostos* and the preservation of one's family and household. Thus, the different contexts that these two epic poems are set in

allows a conceptualization of heroism that presents a complete picture of heroism for all instances of Homeric society.

While this thesis will explore the various forms of heroism within different contexts, I will argue that the foundational value of all forms of Homeric heroism (both Iliadic and Odyssean) is connection. Interpersonal connection is what allows heroes within the Homeric world to achieve *kleos*, as this *kleos* is predicated on the fact that a hero is reliant upon others to remember his legacy and to convert his deeds into song following his death. This then means that the Achaean poet, divinely inspired by the Muses is in control of who receives *kleos*.¹⁴ Therefore, no matter how much a hero excelled in their prescribed medium (i.e., war or *nostos*) without his connection(s) to his fellow man or family, through whom their deeds would be transmitted to the poets, their *kleos* could not be accomplished. This dependence upon someone to remember their deeds and ensure their legacy persisted after death makes the connection between heroes and others the foundational value of all Homeric heroism, in all contexts that the poet provides through these epic poems.¹⁵ These connections that heroes rely upon are interpersonal in nature, and often revolve around mutual respect. I will show how mutual respect between soldiers, family, spouses and even at times enemies is a point of connection in the Homeric world. These connections, however, are not limited to one-on-one interpersonal relationships (such as Odysseus and Penelope) but also extend to the

¹⁴ Nagy, 1979. pg. 16-17. As Nagy notes the word *kleos* should etymologically have meant “that which is heard”, however, because poetry in this society confers glory, we come to the point where *kleos* comes to mean glory, attainable by heroes.

¹⁵ This notion of legacy after death and how it is related to connection will be discussed in more detail later in the Introduction, as well as in each of the following chapters.

interpersonal relationships that form in a group dynamic (such as Ajax and his fellow soldiers in the Greek camp). The broad conception of connection is inclusive of the connections that are defined by the Greek terms *philos* and *xenia*. These two specific iterations of a connection are important at various times for heroism, and will be discussed when relevant, but for the purposes of this thesis, these two terms are not representative of the broader definition of connection and all that it entails.¹⁶ The nature of *kleos* means that connections are a crucial part of a hero's life, and they serve as the foundational value to all Homeric heroism.

While this foundational value of connection is what ultimately lies at the heart of Homeric heroism in all forms, there are other secondary key values that operate on top of this foundation that also help to inform heroes actions. Honor and shame are the two main motivators that have been focused on in relation to heroism. The characteristic of honour was proved through strength, bravery, and physical prowess. In contrast to this a hero had to not show any weakness nor any cowardice in any aspect of their life, especially on the battlefield, as this was related to the value of shame.¹⁷ The positive values of *time* and *kleos* and the negative value of shame helped shape heroes' choices and drove their actions in life. One medium that allowed the demonstration of these heroic traits was war, with bravery and physical prowess winning glory for the hero, which in turn endowed life with meaning.¹⁸ Honor and glory were able to endow life with meaning because there was no significant afterlife in Homer. Achilles and

¹⁶ For a philological study of friendship see Konstan, 1997; especially pages 8-11, 24-30, and 33-37.

¹⁷ Finley, 1954. pg. 28

¹⁸ Schein, 1984. pg. 68

Agamemnon are simply in the Underworld, distinctly not the Fields of Elysium, when Odysseus converses with them in the *Odyssey* (Book 11). This lack of afterlife meant that what a character could accomplish and suffer in life as a mortal carried more weight.¹⁹ A hero then sought as much *time* as he could within his lifetime so that his name won immortality through an everlasting *kleos*.²⁰ This pair of values is shown most clearly in the discussion between Sarpedon and Glaucus when they clash on the battlefield in the *Iliad*, Book 12. Sarpedon poses the question Γλαῦκε τί ἦ δὴ νῶϊ **τετιμῆμεσθα** μάλιστα ἔδρη τε κρέασίν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσιν ἐν Λυκίῃ (Glaucus, why are we both honored in Lycia, especially in the seat of honour both with meat and full goblets?) (Il.12.310-312).

²¹ The answer to which he then provides himself when he says:

τῶ νῦν χρὴ Λυκίοισι μέτα πρώτοισιν ἐόντας
 ἐστάμεν ἠδὲ μάχης καυστείρης ἀντιβολῆσαι,
 ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἴπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων:
 οὐ μὰν **ἀκλεέες** Λυκίην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν
 ἡμέτεροι βασιλῆες, ἔδουσί τε πίονα μῆλα
 οἴνον τ' ἔξαιτον μελιδέα: ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ ἴς
 ἐσθλή, ἐπεὶ Λυκίοισι μέτα πρώτοισι μάχονται.

“For now, it is necessary for us to be among the first of the Lycians to make a stand and to meet battle raging, so that anyone of the strongly armed Lycians may say, “Truly they are not without fame, the lords of Lycia, our kings, who eat fat cuts of sheep, whichever is the honey sweet choice. But they owe it to their fighting strength when they lead the Lycians into battle.” (Il.12.315-321)

This speech made by Sarpedon highlights the matrix of honour and shame as outlined above, with these values being predicated on the fact that there is a connection between

¹⁹ Schein, 1984. pg. 68-69

²⁰ Schein, 1984. pg. 17

²¹ All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

lord and community. There is a reciprocal relationship at play here where the lords are *τετιμήμεσθα* and in exchange they risk their lives at the forefront of battle. This social contract of valor in exchange for honour, which can be seen as a form of reciprocity, is laid out in clear terms.²² Without the bodily risk that these lords engage in they would not be receiving physical honours such as the choice portions of meat. The physical honours presented, the *geras*, emphasize how honour was constructed not only as an abstract notion within heroic society but was seen a tangible prize that could be obtained. Furthermore, the honor they receive is not only gained in physical reward but also in the reputation that they are not *ἀκλέεες*, the implication being that a lord that was *ἀκλέεες* was one that would have been unfit to lead. One thus proves their worth of honor through their strength, bravery, and physical prowess. Through the conduct of these actions, one is able to display these traits to their fellow heroes or their subjects, as Sarpedon mentions, who are then responsible for giving *geras*, *time*, and in death *kleos* to the hero. Therefore, while this speech highlights the importance of the honour/shame matrix that was prevalent in Homeric society, without the interpersonal relationship that Sarpedon has forged with his people there is no framework for this matrix to operate in. Connection between lord and subject is what allows this reciprocal relationship to take place.

The concepts of *time* and *kleos* are aligned with one another. A hero is one who earns *time* during their lifetime, and the more *time* that they are awarded the greater their *kleos* when they die. Therefore, the need to gain and maintain *time* in order to obtain

²² Hainsworth, 1993. pg. 352; Redfield, 1994. pg. 103

kleos is one of the major factors driving a hero.²³ *Kleos* serves as a key value as it is what preserves and disseminates a hero's name and deeds even after death.²⁴ The prophecy Thetis speaks to Achilles regarding his fate at Troy highlights the importance of *kleos*.

She says:

“μήτηρ γάρ τέ μέ φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
διχθαδίας κήρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλος δέ.
εἰ μὲν κ' αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ᾧλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·
εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ᾧλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰῶν
ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ᾧκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη. (Il.9.410-416)

For my goddess mother, silver footed Thetis says
that two fates bear me to the day of death.
If I besiege the city remaining here at Troy,
it would destroy my homecoming,
but my **glory** would be undying.
But if I go home to the fatherland I love,
then I destroy my good **glory**, but the years for me would be long,
and the day I would die will not arrive swiftly. (Il.9.410-416)

The choice presented here to Achilles is one of either an immortal name, gained through *kleos*, which requires him to sacrifice the longevity of his life, or a long life where his name will fade into obscurity. Just as with the Sarpedon speech we can see a binary relationship between *kleos* and death starting to form. The hero, in the form of Achilles here, appears unable to have both everlasting *kleos* and a long fulfilling life. The difference here between the majority of Homer's heroes and Achilles is the concrete knowledge of death and we will return to how this sets Achilles apart from the

²³ Adkins, 1960. pg. 63

²⁴ King, 1987. pg. 6

uncomplicated iterations of Iliadic heroism. The concept of everlasting *kleos* that Thetis outlines, however, remains constant and is a cornerstone value of heroism.

The counterpart to honour within all Homeric heroism is the avoidance of shame. This is because ideas of shame are associated to cowardice and the return of the warrior following defeat.²⁵ This feeling of shame is a product of the words and actions that one who fails within the context of Homeric society will suffer from his comrades.²⁶ These actions are antithetical to the pursuit of *time* and thus must be avoided by a hero at all costs. Shame can be invoked as a motivator for warriors who are considering abandoning the heroic code and engaging in acts that would be deemed cowardly. Thus, shame functions as the force that keeps heroes in line with the heroic code and is what keeps them focused on the pursuit of *time*. We see this function of shame in Book 11 when Odysseus exhorts Diomedes to stand fast:

ἔνθά κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέροντο,
καὶ νῦ κεν ἐν νήεσσι πέσον φεύγοντες Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ κέκλετ' Ὀδυσσεύς:
Τυδεΐδῃ τί παθόντε λελάσμεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς;
ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο πέπον, παρ' ἔμ' ἴσταο: δὴ γὰρ ἔλεγχος
ἔσσεται εἴ κεν νῆας ἔλη κορυθαίολος Ἴεκτωρ.

Now there would have been havoc and extraordinary work,
and even now fleeing Achaeans fell back to the ships,
if Odysseus had not exhorted the son of Tydeus, Diomedes,
“O Son of Tydeus, what has happened that we have forgotten our battle fury?
But come here, O good friend, stand with me! For it would

²⁵ Zanker, 1994. pg. 51

²⁶ Adkins, 1960. pg. 33-34

certainly be a **dishonour** if Hektor with the glancing helm shall seize the ships.”

(Il.11.310-315)

This speech serves to ground both heroes and results in them pushing back the Trojan forces (Il.11.320-327). The driving force spurring these heroes on is not the pursuit of *time* but the fear that they will be dishonoured if they allow Hektor and his forces to best them in combat. There is a distinct fear of being the weak point in the battle line and being seen as the warrior who failed in his duty. This is the role that shame plays in driving heroes' actions. Heroes, when they need to provide additional motivation beyond the intrinsic and self-centered pursuit of glory, turn to shame, and the fear of being perceived as a coward checks their less heroic impulses.²⁷ This operates on top of the value of connection as the avoidance of shame allows a hero to maintain the key connections needed within the group, as being shamed sets one apart as other from the community. We see even nameless characters invoking this honour/shame matrix to remind their comrades why they are fighting:

ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων:
‘ὦ φίλοι οὐ μὰν ἦμιν ἐὺκλεῆς ἀπονέεσθαι
νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ γαῖα μέλαινα
πᾶσι χάνοι: τό κεν ἦμιν ἄφαρ πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη
εἰ τοῦτον Τρώεσσι μεθήσομεν ἵπποδάμοισιν
ἄστυ πότι σφέτερον ἐρύσαι καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι.

And thus, one of the bronze-clad Achaeans said:
“**O friends**, truly there is no **glory** in the return to our hollow ships, but let the black earth gape for all of us. For straightaway this would be more profitable for us if we abandon this man to the horse-breaking Trojans, to drag him to their own city and to take up the **glory**. (Il.17.414-419)

²⁷ Finley, 1954, pg. 116

The unnamed soldier here provides a nice summary of how the values of honour and shame operate within Homeric society, and how they operate on top of the foundational value of connection. The invocation of *ὦ φίλοι* before the appeal of honour and shame reinforces this idea: for the honour/shame invocation to be effective there must be a connection between these soldiers. The group dynamic of men who are seeking the same goal, facing the same threat, and relying upon one another to some extent for survival allows this soldier to talk to them in this manner. Without an interpersonal relationship, this speech simply becomes one man talking to a group of strangers and would be less emphatic. Instead, the connection allows the soldier to be persuasive. Thus, having established that this is an equal addressing equals the soldier lays out that retreat provides no glory and thus must not be considered a valid option for any true hero. It is preferable for the hero to die before being seen to retreat or to lose in a competition of physical prowess. Lastly, this unnamed soldier puts the emphasis here on the victor as being the group that will receive the glory. In the soldier's world there are only two options: fight with your comrades and upon being victorious have glory conferred upon you OR die fighting on the battlefield in the pursuit of glory.

We see Homer presenting to the reader a foundational value that underlies all heroes in interpersonal connection, and then he builds a matrix of secondary values upon that which heroes are expected to follow, and the majority do follow.²⁸ Sarpedon

²⁸ Other good discussions of heroism approach it from the opposite, the concept of the anti-hero. For more on the anti-hero in poetry, and the resulting discussions of heroism see: Swift, 2012, and Barker and Christensen, 2006.

expounds the logic behind why heroes risk their lives on the frontlines of battle, and we are given concrete examples of both the short-term *time* and the long term *kleos* that they not only expect to receive for their actions but also the physical rewards (*geras*) that they have been given for their actions. This relationship between risk and reward is contingent upon the mortality of the hero. Thetis' prophecy highlights the dichotomy that exists; a hero must choose between *kleos* or longevity. Lastly, the avoidance of shame rounds out this group of values. The avoidance of shame is the reverse of the coin to the obtaining of *time/kleos*. If *time/kleos* is to be sought, shame is to be avoided and shame can be used to drive warriors towards *kleos*. This matrix, however, is reliant on the framework that interpersonal connections forms for it, without people recognizing the values of honour and shame in one another there is no measurement for one's actions and therefore no one to assign value to these heroes and provide to them *kleos* upon death. I have only discussed the honour/shame matrix in relation to the *Iliad* for the moment, as Chapter 1 continues the discussion of heroism in the *Iliad*. Chapter 3 will discuss in detail how the foundational value of connection and the honour/shame matrix apply to the *Odyssey* and its new form of heroism. The ideas laid out here serve as the basic framework for the thesis and will be expanded upon throughout its entirety.

Chapter 1: The Iliadic Hero

This chapter will continue to explore how connection is the foundation of heroism in the *Iliad*, with the matrix of honor/shame operating upon it, while also demonstrating how Homer builds different iterations of heroism within different characters. Firstly, I will examine Iliadic heroism, which brings the pursuit of *time* and *kleos* while avoiding shame, to the medium of the battlefield, set within the context of war. This medium means that heroes rely upon their physical strength and prowess to excel and behave honourably on the battlefield. Ajax will be the first Iliadic hero that I investigate, as his characterization serves to present the uncomplicated version of the Iliadic heroic code to the audience. I will then move on to looking at how Achilles who, becoming disenfranchised with the Iliadic heroic code as embodied by Ajax, reassesses and redefines the Iliadic heroic code to fit his unique situation. Finally, I will look at how the character of Hektor is yet another example of Homer complicating Iliadic heroism. The chapter overall, will expand upon the core notions of connection and honour/shame as discussed above, and will show how these values interact in the *Iliad* to present Iliadic heroism.

The Homeric version of Ajax serves as a prime example of a warrior who follows this Iliadic heroic code. He is a hero who is driven solely by his love of honour and this single-minded focus is what provides him with his characteristic courage in battle.¹ He even explicitly states that the reason he and his fellow Greek soldiers risk their lives is for honor, highlighting the core relationship between the honour/shame matrix and the

¹ Kundmueller, 2019, pg. 26

battlefield in the Iliadic heroic code. One instance of this is in Book 15 when he exhorts his fellow soldiers:

Ἀργείους δ' ὄτρυνε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας:
'ὦ φίλοι ἄνδρες ἔστε, καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.
αἰδομένων δ' ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σοοὶ ἢ ἐπέφανται:
φευγόντων δ' οὔτ' ἄρ κλέος ὄρνυται οὔτε τις ἀλκή.

But huge Telamonian Ajax encouraged the Achaeans:
“**O friends**, be men, and take **shame** in your heart,
and be **ashamed** of each other among the mighty combat,
and of **ashamed** men, many more are spared than wounded;
but for the ones fleeing neither **glory** nor any strength arises. (Il.15.560-564)

As he is representative of the form of the Iliadic hero, Ajax employs language that resonates with not only the foundational value of connection, but also the language of shame and honour to motivate the Achaeans. Before Ajax even begins his shame-based exhortations he firstly establishes a connection. His use of the word *φίλοι*, to address the unnamed soldiers that he fights alongside allows us to infer that there is a bond between them. This word, often meaning affection or friendship, implies that there is a connection between Ajax and these men. He is familiar with them and there is a strong enough relationship that he feels comfortable employing strong shame-based language to rebuke them. Therefore, having drawn upon his connection with them and this reciprocal relationship that exists in the warrior community, he then is able to use the language of shame to remind them of the consequence of being bested. In his hands shame, and the social consequences of being shamed, are a weapon readily used to make fellow soldiers stand fast. He then drives home their mortality, saying that if they flee the chance is higher that they will survive. Ajax drives their mortality home not to cause fear in his

comrades, but to remind them that it is due to their mortality that they are able to achieve everlasting *kleos* on the battlefield. This logic is proven in the closing line where he reminds his fellow Achaeans that those who submit to their shame and allow it to make them flee do not receive glory. Thus, it is those soldier's that take their shame and convert it into *bie* on the battlefield that receive *kleos*, and through his exhortation Ajax is reminding the Achaeans of what it means to be an Iliadic hero.

Ajax not only exhorts his fellow soldiers to follow the Iliadic heroic code, but he also exemplifies it with his own actions. We can see his love of glory in his reaction to his lot being drawn to face Hektor in single combat. Ajax reacts:

γνῶ δὲ κλήρου σῆμα ἰδὼν, γήθησε δὲ θυμῷ.
τὸν μὲν πὰρ πόδ' ἔδον χαμάδις βάλε φώνησέν τε:
ὦ φίλοι ἦτοι κλῆρος ἐμός, χαίρω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
θυμῷ, ἐπεὶ δοκέω νικησέμεν Ἴκτορα δῖον.

And perceiving the lot he cast, he rejoiced in his soul.
Indeed, he saw it on the ground by his own foot and he spoke,
“**O friends**, truly the lot is mine, and my heart rejoices,
for I expect to conquer god-like Hektor. (II.7.189-192)

The reaction of Ajax is one of rejoicing as he sees presented to him an opportunity to win great glory through the defeat of Hektor. The defeat of another hero is the foremost way to achieve glory in the Homeric poems and therefore the defeat of a hero who is given the epithet *δῖον* would bestow a great amount to the hero who achieved this. In the ensuing combat, Ajax does not manage to defeat the Trojan prince but fights him to a standstill. When the combat ceases at the end of the day Ajax is honoured for his prowess in single combat by the Achaeans. For at the feast:

νώτοισιν δ' Αἴαντα διηνεκέεσσι γέραιρεν
ἥρωσ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὸν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων.

And Ajax was honoured with the whole length of chine
by the heroic son of Atreus, the wide ruling Agamemnon. (Il.7.321-322).

Ajax for his actions that fall within Iliadic heroic code is honoured in the appropriate way with the typical *geras* of the choice portions at a feast.² Furthermore, this statement by Ajax broadcasts the appropriate reaction to being chosen for combat to his fellow heroes. As in the earlier passage, we see Ajax utilize ὧ φίλοι as a way to broadcast to his fellow heroes and soldiers his paradigmatic heroic emotions. The joy Ajax feels at the opportunity to win *kleos* through this single combat must be expressed aloud, in order to leave no doubt that he fits the matrix of honour and shame. Without the audience of heroes that Ajax is connected to, and he deems as φίλοι, there is less of an opportunity for Ajax to demonstrate his characterization as the epitome of the Iliadic heroic code.

Ajax solidifies that he is unfailing in this Iliadic notion of heroism with his actions in the *Odyssey*. Even when Odysseus encounters the hero in the underworld his notions of honour and shame hold fast:

οἷη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα νίκης,
τὴν μιν ἐγὼ νίκησα δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ
τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλλῆος: ἔθηκε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ.
παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκασαν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

But the spirit of Ajax, son of Telamon alone stood apart,
still angry on account of the victory, which I won over him
in judgement by the ships for the arms of Achilles:
for his revered mother set them out. And the sons of Troy
and Pallas Athena were the judges. (Od.11.543-547)

² Kirk, 1990. pg. 276

From this speech we can see how Ajax's defining Iliadic characteristics as a hero have persisted even in death. Odysseus reveals that a contest of honour was the reason for Ajax's death, showcasing the destructive side of the pursuit of glory. Schein summarizes the dichotomy of glory best when they say that the pursuit of glory can be "creative or fruitful and at the same time both destructive and self-destructive."³ Just as Ajax was rewarded for his pursuit of glory in combat against Hektor, here Ajax's death is a direct result of love of honour and his pursuit of glory. The destructive element of the Iliadic heroic code manifests itself here as suicide, thus Ajax's portrayal in the *Odyssey* complicates his portrayal as the ideal Iliadic hero. This complication of Ajax as the representative of Iliadic heroism is now being presented because we have moved away from the medium of war. Thus, Homer complicates the idea of Iliadic heroism by portraying what happens to such a hero where the medium they obtain glory is no longer a viable option. We see an overt reference to his suicide when Odysseus says:

ὥς δὴ μὴ ὄφελον νικᾶν τοιῶδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλω:
τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ἔνεκ' αὐτῶν γαῖα κατέσχευ,
Αἴανθ', ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.

Oh, that I had not been victorious in the contest for these arms!
For on account of those arms the earth covered such a great head,
even Ajax, who was most well made in figure and greatest in work
of all other Achaeans after the blameless son of Peleus. (Od.11.548-551)

³ Schein, 1984. pg. 71

These lines directly allude to Ajax taking his own life, which Sophocles will later develop into his tragedy.⁴ Through his loss of the competition of arms to Odysseus, Ajax feels his honour has been slighted and is thus consumed by his rage which he carries with him in even death. Therefore, Achilles is not the only example of a hero whose honour leads to wrath that contains consequences. Ajax as well, through an examination of his character in both poems, shows the destructive side of the pursuit of honour at all costs. Within his address to Ajax's shade, Odysseus still utilizes the language of the Iliadic hero in an attempt to mollify his anger:

τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπέεσσι προσηύδων μελιχίοισιν:
Αἴαν, παῖ Τελαμῶνος ἀμύμονος, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες
οὐδὲ θανὼν λήσεσθαι ἐμοὶ χόλου εἵνεκα τευχέων
οὐλομένων; τὰ δὲ πῆμα θεοὶ θέσαν Ἀργείοισι,
τοῖος γάρ σφιν πύργος ἀπόλεο: σεῖο δ' Ἀχαιοὶ
ἴσον Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῇ Πηληϊάδαο
ἀχνύμεθα φθιμένοιο διαμπερές:

And I addressed him with soothing words,
“Ajax, son of noble Telamon, even in death,
will you still not forget your wrath for me on account of those accursed arms?
For certainly, the gods set them as the bane of the Argives,
for such a great tower they destroyed,
and the Argives wasted away grieving for you
as we did for the life of Achilles, son of Peleus. (Od.11.552-558)

He opens his persuasive argument by drawing attention to the fact that this anger persists even in death, highlighting that it is an unusual emotion to carry to the underworld. As I stated earlier, the values that governed heroes' actions were predicated on their mortality, therefore their actions in the Underworld are of little consequence to their *kleos*.

⁴ Heubeck, 1989. pg. 110

Odysseus then appeals to Ajax's heroic temperament by praising him as if he were still alive, focusing on his physical prowess serving as a πύργος, specifically in the fight for the ships (Il.15 and 16), and equating him to Achilles who was the best of the Achaeans.⁵ The language used is one that reaffirms Ajax's position as an Iliadic hero, someone who excelled physically in the medium of the battlefield, but still one whose need to be honoured has driven him to death. Lastly, Odysseus turns to the value of shame and responsibility as part of his persuasive speech:

οὐδέ τις ἄλλος
αἴτιος, ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς Δαναῶν στρατὸν αἰχμητῶν
ἐκπάγλως ἤχθηρε, τείν δ' ἐπὶ μοῖραν ἔθηκεν.
ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο, ἄναξ, ἴν' ἔπος καὶ μῦθον ἀκούσης
ἡμέτερον: δάμασον δὲ μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμόν.
ὧς ἐφάμην, ὁ δέ μ' οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο, βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας
ψυχὰς εἰς Ἔρεβος νεκῶν κατατεθνηώτων.

Yet there is no other to blame but Zeus,
who hated the army of Danaan spearmen,
and set down on them their doom.
But come closer, O Lord, in order that you may hear
our word and speech. And subdue your anger and your heroic spirit.”
So I spoke, but Ajax did not answer me,
and he walked among other shades into Erebus,
disappearing with the other dead. (Od.11.558-562)

The appeal made here removes any agency from Ajax in his death. He is not the one to blame, even if he has taken his life with his own hand, but instead the gods and Zeus are responsible for his death. This idea of *μοῖρα* is one consistent with other Iliadic heroes, as we will see when examining Achilles and Hektor shortly. Through his invocation of Zeus and *μοῖρα* Odysseus is attempting to remove the shame that Ajax feels at having lost the

⁵ Heubeck, 1989. pg. 110.

contest of arms, thus having his honour slighted, leading to this wrath that has carried improbably into death. Through this address to Ajax by Odysseus we are able to see how Ajax still fits within the framework of the Iliadic heroic code.⁶ The language of the address is the language of the Iliadic warrior because Ajax understands nothing but that world. Overall, Ajax's portrayal in both Homeric poems with his relentless pursuit of honour and glory, combined with his shame-based exhortations, and his inability to separate himself from this code of honour even in death makes him a quintessential Iliadic hero. Ajax operates based upon the honour/shame matrix and relies upon the foundation of connection to do so. His actions and emotions that are part of this value matrix are all reliant upon his ability to share them with his fellow soldiers and heroes that make up his network of connections. The repeated use of *ὦ φίλοι* whenever he discusses these values emphasizes its importance in providing framework to allow the operation of the honour/shame matrix.⁷

Through the examination of Ajax, I have established the dominant form of the Iliadic heroic code that Homer lays out. I can now turn to an examination of variations of this heroic code and look at how Homer challenges the code which they themselves establish. Achilles and Hektor, the foremost heroes for the Achaeans and the Trojans respectively, both challenge the Iliadic heroic code in different ways. Achilles appears to be the ideal embodiment of the Iliadic heroic code until he becomes disenfranchised with

⁶ For more on Ajax serving as a hero whose defining characteristic is his love of honor see Kundmueller, 2019.

⁷ Ajax is not the only hero to use the phrase *ὦ φίλοι* as it is a standard vocative address across the Homeric poems. However, the formulaic nature of this phrase does not diminish the meaning of it in the contexts discussed. For more on formulaic language see Graziosi and Haubold, 2005. Ch. 1 and 2.

it. He returns to the foundational ideal of connection while he disregards the motivators of *kleos* and *time*.⁸ Hektor, in contrast does not become disenfranchised with the heroic code, instead his view of the heroic code is complicated by a drive to maintain his interpersonal connections with his family, and the personal pursuit of glory for him is intrinsically tied to the defense and care of his community. Thus, Hektor's characterization is crucial to understanding the role of interpersonal connections in heroism, as these connections ultimately threaten to break his heroic nature, but in the end are what drives him to conform to it. However, Achilles reassesses and redefines Iliadic heroism, responding solely to the foundational value of connection.

The *Iliad* is a song dedicated to the subject of Achilles, specifically his wrath (Il.1.1), and as the greatest fighter on the Achaean force, shown through the repetitive honorary epithet of ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν (the best of the Achaeans),⁹ Homer sets him up to be the pinnacle when it comes to heroism. However, the poet subverts this expectation when Achilles withdraws from the battlefield, the preestablished medium where glory is gained,¹⁰ and appears to choose a life of longevity and anonymity, the only other option prophesized for his fate (Il.9.410-416). Therefore, in the poem that is conveying the everlasting *kleos* that each hero seeks, Achilles grapples with the notions of heroism and at times outright rejects key components of Iliadic heroism. I will examine the slight that begins the process of Achilles' disenfranchisement from the Iliadic heroic code, why Achilles responds the way he does to said slight, why the many attempts at reconciliation

⁸ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 51.

⁹ Nagy, 1979. pg. 26.

¹⁰ Schein, 1984. pg. 68.

fail, and finally the reintegration of Achilles into the heroic society of the Achaeans, among whom he cements his legacy as *ἄριστος*, as he follows a reimagined form of Iliadic heroism.

Achilles is famously offended by Agamemnon in Book 1 of the *Iliad* when Achilles *geras* in the form of Briseis is demanded from him by the king. Here we have competing interests of *time* between the two main forces of the Achaean army coming together in conflict. *Time* is the social currency that dictates societal hierarchy, and this currency is maintained through prowess in battle, sport, or in this instance the council.¹¹ Achilles is the “best of the Achaeans” when it comes to combat and physical skills, yet Agamemnon is also given the title of *ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν* as the commander of the whole Greek invasion force.¹² The former wins his *time* through individual prowess and the latter is given *time* through the achievements of the whole. Achilles lays out this gathering of *time* when he tells Agamemnon:

“ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν τήνδε θεῶ πρόες: αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ
τριπλῆ τετραπλῆ τ’ ἀποτείσομεν, αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς
δῶσι πόλιν Τροίην εὐτείχεον ἐξαλαπάξαι.”

“But send the girl back to the god now, and
the Achaeans will repay you, three, four times over,
if Zeus ever allows us to sack the well-walled city of Troy.” (Il.1.127-129)

Therefore, this clash of honour between the two men who are both *ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν* will lead to some offense. In fact, Agamemnon’s insistence on the preservation of his honour

¹¹ Zanker, 1994. pg. 11.

¹² Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 33,35-36.

shows how the values of *time* and *kleos* within heroism as outlined above can be detrimental. By placing his self worth and his personal *time* at the top of his hierarchy of needs and the core of his heroism, Agamemnon manages to nullify any potential applications of *time* to societal relations and he hamstringing his army by removing his best fighter from combat.¹³ This lack of awareness of the intersection of *time* and connections displays how little Agamemnon understands about Iliadic heroism, as well as highlighting the importance of keeping connection, not honour as the core of this heroism. This lack of awareness in turn reduces his own *time* as acting commander, but due to his misinterpretation of what is foundational to heroism, he thinks that he must seek to gain and defend his *time* at every instance, and thus Agamemnon fails to pay any mind to the consequences of how the honour/shame is reliant upon the tenet of connection. Therefore, through his removal of Achilles' war prize, a direct physical embodiment of his *time* that he has earned on the battlefield, Agamemnon has brought shame upon Achilles which he cannot let go unanswered. Achilles' initial reaction in his fury is to strike Agamemnon down for this insult (Il.1.188-214), but when Athena stays his hand he instead verbally lashes out at Agamemnon, withdrawing from combat (Il.1.223-244) and ends his tirade by saying, “σὺ δ' ἔνδοθι θυμὸν ἀμύξεις χῳόμενος ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας.” (But now you will tear your heart, angry that you did not honour the best of the Achaeans.) (Il.1.243-244). It is definitively stated that the lack of respect, intrinsically tied to Achilles' prowess on the battlefield, is what causes him to withdraw from the fight. These two men are both ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν and therefore should

¹³ Zanker, 1994. pg. 59.

regard each other as equals. This then could be the basis of that crucial interpersonal relationship that honour and shame operate on top of. However, Agamemnon's prioritization of honour over a connection based upon mutual respect causes the societal values of honor and shame to break down, leading to such an egregious slight against Achilles.

Here we must wonder why Achilles is willing to risk not only the success of the entire expedition to Troy but also his own personal *kleos* over this incident. While his actions fit with the values of Iliadic heroism, as Agamemnon ignores the connection that should be present between heroes, and as his *time* must be upheld at all times, nonetheless this singular slight provokes a very extreme reaction. This seemingly extreme reaction is based upon Achilles' knowledge of his dual fates. To be an Iliadic hero means that one must and will always face death when they step out onto the battlefield,¹⁴ however there is a difference between most heroes who enter battle and Achilles. Achilles, due to his knowledge of his dual fates from Thetis, is not simply *risking* his life in battle like the other heroes. If he chooses to fight at Troy, he is *sacrificing* his life.¹⁵ It is a preordained fact that cannot be avoided. The fact that Achilles knows that he will die at Troy, means that he feels that he should be awarded greater *time* and therefore greater *kleos*. Therefore, when any offense to his honour occurs, he is all the more sensitive to it.¹⁶ His unique knowledge of his death at a young age means that he thinks he should receive *kleos* equal to the sacrifice that he is consciously aware that he is making. The *kleos* will

¹⁴ Nagy, 1979. pg. 9.

¹⁵ King, 1987. pg. 7.

¹⁶ Schein, 1984. pg. 100-101.

serve as his reward for the sacrifice of his life, his return home, and any chance at family that otherwise would have served as a portion of his legacy. Therefore, when he does not receive the appropriate *time* in proportion to the sacrifice he is making, he withdraws until reparations are made and he sees there is sufficient value in exchange for him sacrificing his life. Therefore, while Achilles may be observing the value of connection and the honour/shame matrix that operates on top of that, we can start to see how Homer is already setting Achilles apart from the other Iliadic heroes in his reactions and approach to heroism.

We begin to see the reworking of Iliadic heroism once Achilles has fully withdrawn from the fighting. Homer does not have Achilles return to battle when traditional reparations are offered to him, as we may expect based on the form of Iliadic heroism that has been laid out. In Book 9, Agamemnon having been convinced that Achilles must rejoin the fray sends the group of Ajax, Phoenix, and Odysseus to appease his wounded honour. It is here that Achilles' disenfranchisement with the honour portion of the system he finds himself in is shown most clearly. Odysseus makes the first attempt to win Achilles back to the battlefield, and the heart of his plea is honour-based (Il.9.225-306). After presenting the long list of gifts he concludes his plea with an appeal directly to Achilles' love of honour:

εἰ δέ τοι Ἀτρεΐδης μὲν ἀπήχθετο κηρόθι μᾶλλον
 αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα, σὺ δ' ἄλλους περ Παναχαιοὺς
 τειρομένους ἐλέαιρε κατὰ στρατόν, οἷ σε θεὸν ὧς
τίσουσ': ἧ γάρ κέ σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἄροιο:
 νῦν γάρ χ' Ἔκτορ' ἔλοις, ἐπεὶ ἂν μάλα τοι σχεδὸν ἔλθοι
 λύσσαν ἔχων ὀλοήν, ἐπεὶ οὐ τίνα φησιν ὁμοῖον
 οἷ ἔμναι Δαναῶν οὐς ἐνθάδε νῆες ἔνεικαν.

But if the son of Atreus is still hated with all your heart,
himself and his gifts, then pity the rest of the Achaeans
distressed throughout the army, they will **honour** you like a god,
for you will win especially great **glory** from them
For now you may kill Hektor,
since he would come near to you having destructive rage,
for he says there is no one like him among the Danaans,
that the ships brought here. (Il.9.300-306)

With his use of the verb *τιμάω* in the 3rd person plural future tense, Odysseus is clearly reinforcing the ideal of the Iliadic heroic code ideal that potential honour is always available on the battlefield. Furthermore, because he is addressing Achilles, the greatest fighter of the Achaeans, he elevates this honour to be on the same level as the divine. He does this as he believes he must flatter Achilles' wounded ego to make up for the honour deprived to him by Agamemnon and all the honour he has missed by removing himself from the battlefield. Odysseus is even conscious that he must compensate for Agamemnon's continued folly in ignoring the need to make a connection with Achilles. If we compare the end of the list of gifts that Agamemnon informs the messengers to relay to Achilles with the end of Odysseus' list, we can see a deliberate omission by Odysseus. Agamemnon to end his list of gifts says:

καί οἱ ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ λιπαρὰς τελέουσι θέμιστας.
ταῦτά κέ οἱ τελέσαιμι μεταλήξαντι χόλοιο.
δηθήτω: Ἄϊδης τοι ἀμείλιχος ἦδ' ἀδάμαστος,
τοῦνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν ἔχθιστος ἀπάντων:
καί μοι ὑποστήτω ὅσσον βασιλεύτερός εἰμι
ἦδ' ὅσσον γενεῆ προγενέστερος εὖχομαι εἶναι.

And I will accomplish all this if he ceases his wrath.
Let him yield- Hades is unyielding and stubborn,
For he is the most hated of all gods by mortal men-
Let him submit to me, for I am so much more kingly,

and I swear that I am elder in years than him. (Il.9.156-161)

Agamemnon continues to believe that this issue is one of solely honour in the form of *geras*. He thinks that his offer of material indications of honour will be sufficient to win Achilles back, without needing to repair the damage that he has caused to him on the level of connection. Odysseus, while having an honour-centric appeal, recognizes that Agamemnon is erring by further degrading the connection between himself and Achilles, and omits these lines. Instead, as we saw above, he ends with the plea to his sense of honour and the attempted sense of shame that Achilles should feel as Hektor insults his physical prowess. However, his attempts to win over Achilles with this tactic are misguided. What he fails to recognize is that Achilles has removed himself from the honour-centric part of warrior society that is a key element of the Iliadic heroic code, and the prime imperative to seek personal *kleos* above everything else is no longer what drives him.

We can observe this change in priorities when we look at Achilles' response to Odysseus (Il.9.307-429). Achilles in his response uses the language of the honour/shame society that he lives in (*γέρας*, *ἄριστα*, *μοῖρα*, *κύνεός*, *τιμῆ*, and *κλέος*) however, he rejects these values of the code simultaneously. We see this when he says:

ἴση **μοῖρα** μένοντι καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι:
ἐν δὲ ἰῆ **τιμῆ** ἡμὲν κακὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός:
κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς.
οὐδέ τί μοι περίκειται, ἐπεὶ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῶ
αἰεὶ ἐμὴν ψυχὴν παραβαλλόμενος πολεμίζειν.

There is an equal portion for the one who waits and the one who battles fiercely.
And there is equal honour for both the good man and the evil one.

They descend into Death all the same, both he who is idle and he who works greatly.
And there is no advantage to me, suffering pain in my heart, always risking my soul to
fight. (Il.9.318-322)

Here Achilles inverts everything about the role of honour in the Iliadic heroic code. He takes honour which is supposed to be the pinnacle of achievement and reduces its value through the logic that all become equal in death. This makes the primary pursuit of *kleos* irrelevant to him, as the cost of this *kleos* (his death) will not be rewarded in the afterlife. Achilles is inverting a main tenet of Iliadic heroism that one must win honour in war and use their mortal life to accumulate this social currency because once one dies there is nothing significant for a hero in the afterlife.¹⁷ Following the Iliadic form of heroism, life is only meaningful through the pursuit of glory. Achilles is rejecting this set of ideas on the same premise that makes them worthy in the first place. There is no significance in death, in fact Homer's conceptualization of self is heavily tied to the physical body, rather than the *psuche*. This is because for Homer, the *psuche* is simply an entity that when tied to a body animated it and having departed the body it existed in the underworld with no significant physical or mental existence. Homer also makes the distinction between the *psuche* and the body (*autos*) of the men in the opening lines of the *Iliad* when the *autos* are what remain for the dogs and the birds (Il.1.3-5).¹⁸ Homer thus is concerned with the body as the concept of self, rather than the *psuche* which exists in the Underworld after death. Therefore, because there is no significance in death, and since he who fights and he who stays home receive the same treatment in death, Achilles no

¹⁷ Schein, 1984. pg. 68.

¹⁸ Schein, 1984. pg. 68-69.

longer sees the rewards of *time* and *kleos* as sufficient for his sacrifice.¹⁹ He is choosing to take the path of longevity from his mother’s prophecy as in the end he believes it will all be the same.

Achilles’ rejection of the tenets of honour and shame then allows him to replace these with the valuing of connection, which is why Ajax has the most successful attempt at persuading Achilles to rejoin the war.²⁰ Unlike Odysseus, Ajax does not appeal only to his sense of honour. Instead, Ajax appeals to Achilles on the basis of their friendship. Just as earlier, Ajax recognizes the importance of firstly establishing the bond between heroes, relying upon that foundational value of Homeric heroism. Therefore firstly, with no regard to Achilles, Ajax addresses Odysseus and says:

“αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς
ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν
σχέτλιος, οὐδὲ μετατρέπεται φιλότητος ἑταίρων
τῆς ἧ μιν παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτίομεν ἔξοχον ἄλλων νηλῆς.

As Achilles has made his unflinching heart in his breast great-hearted,
so wild, nor does he show regard for his comrades’ affection,
we honoured him above all others by the ships, the ruthless man. (II.9.628-632).

Ajax is highlighting that Achilles appears unresponsive towards not only the honour the Achaeans have shown him, but also towards the pre-existing friendship with the party sent to negotiate. Since Ajax himself is representative of the uncomplicated Iliadic heroic code he recognizes Achilles’ disenfranchisement with the matrix of societal values and

¹⁹ Zanker, 1994. pg.82.

²⁰ Phoenix has moments where he is able to get Achilles’ resolve to waver with affection based arguments, such as the story of Meleagros (II.9.531-596), but overall Ajax provides an argument more so based on “pure” friendship which is why he is focused on. Zanker, 1994. pg. 90.

that the typical pleas such as the one tried by his comrades will be ineffective.²¹ Having recognized this, Ajax then turns to the one thing that seems to have had an effect on Achilles in the other speeches, pleas of affection and friendship, the foundational value that lays at the heart of heroism. He says:

σὺ δ' ἴλαον ἔνθεο θυμόν,
αἰδέσσαι δὲ μέλαθρον: ὑπώροφιοι δέ τοι εἰμεν
πληθύος ἐκ Δαναῶν, μέμαμεν δέ τοι ἔξοχον ἄλλων
κῆδιστοί τ' ἔμεναι καὶ **φίλτατοι** ὅσσοι Ἀχαιοί.

But put kindness in your heart,
and respect your house. We are here under your roof,
from the throng of Achaeans, and we yearn to be past all other men,
past all other Achaeans, your most cared for and **dearest friends**. (Il.9.639-642)

The appeal here does not utilize honour but instead he appeals to Achilles' humanity and their pre-existing connection as friends. With the use of the word *φίλτατοι* Ajax invokes the crucial interpersonal connection of heroism. With this tactic of asking him to show kindness and respect to his friends and to prioritize the connection that they have with one another, rather than honour, Ajax manages to win the biggest concession from Achilles, that he will rejoin the war, but only when Hektor is in and among the ships (Il.9.650-655).

Of the three appeals for Achilles to rejoin the war, the one that succeeds in gaining that concession is the one which is based on friendship and connection, not honour. Zanker argues that here in Book 9 we can see just how disenfranchised Achilles has become with the notion of heroism as he imagines it. The preordained knowledge of

²¹ Zanker, 1994. pg. 90.

his death, and the significance of death means that there is no impetus for him to pursue Zanker's basic tenants of *time* and *kleos*. The removal of Achilles' war prize, in the form of Briseis, has proven to him that honour is nothing more than a commodity with a shifting value. Thus, the appeals to reintegrate him into warrior society that stem from the secondary value matrix (honour and shame) carry no weight, as Achilles has proven to himself that honour is not a fixed social currency. Therefore, I argue that due to these circumstances, Achilles does not become fully disenfranchised with the notions of heroism, but instead he simply reverts to the foundational value of connection. This reversion to affective impulses now serve as the driving moral force in his life and the driving value behind his heroic deeds.²²

Having outlined Achilles' challenging of the Iliadic heroic code around the foundational value of connection we must then turn to the final portion of Achilles' heroic journey, prompted by the death of his comrade Patroclus. When he learns of Patroclus' death at 16.22-27, we see Achilles overcome with grief at the death of his beloved companion, highlighting that his love for his friend has become his dominant passion, and finally we see him regain his humanity when he shows pity for Priam and returns to him the body of Hektor. Achilles remains removed from the fighting and therefore the medium of the typical Homeric warrior society until the death of Patroclus prompts him in his grief to seek vengeance against his comrade's killer.²³ Upon hearing the news of his friend's death Achilles grieves for him:

²² Zanker, 1994. pg. 90-91.

²³ Patroclus' death, Book 16.818-858; Achilles receives word of Patroclus' death, Book 18.22-27; Achilles discusses his need for vengeance, Book 18.79-93, 97-126, Book 19.198-214.

ὦς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα:
ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν
χεύατο κὰκ κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἤσχυνε πρόσωπον:
νεκταρέῳ δὲ χιτῶνι μέλαιν' ἀμφίζανε τέφρη.
αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κονίησι μέγας μεγαλωστί ταυνοσθεὶς
κεῖτο, φίλησι δὲ χερσὶ κόμην ἤσχυνε δαΐζων.

Thus he spoke, and a black cloud of grief covered Achilles,
And with both hands he seized the black dust,
poured it over his head, and disfigured his beautiful face.
And the black ashes settled on his fragrant tunic.
And he lay outstretched in the dust, great in his greatness,
and with his hands he tore out and disfigured his hair for his beloved. (Il.18.22-27)

This grief that is so visceral it becomes the primary drive that consumes Achilles. This grief is what prompts him to finally accept the fate of a short life and the fact that he will not see his homeland again.²⁴ The first words he speaks after receiving the news about Patroclus' death convey this newfound mindset:

τὴν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς:
'αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἐταίρω
κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμῦναι: ὁ μὲν μάλα τηλόθι πάτρης
ἔφθιτ', ἐμεῖο δὲ δῆσεν ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι.
νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαί γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν...

And then greatly angered, swift footed Achilles said,
"Immediately, may I die! For I was not able to bring aid to my comrade
as he was slain. Far from his homeland he perished,
and he had need of myself to be the protector of his ruin.
And now I will not return to my dear native homeland.... (Il.18.97-101).

Grief as a by-product of a deep emotional connection is a different motivation for heroic acts than we have seen up until this point.²⁵ In Iliadic heroism, before Achilles, we see

²⁴ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 54.

²⁵ For a study on Achilles' anger, and the subsequent change to grief in the later books of the *Iliad* see Konstan, 2003, pg. 13-14.

that glory and honour based on a foundation of connection is what compels warriors to risk their lives and the possibility of seeing their homeland again. Therefore, we see that Achilles has rejected the honour-based portion of the warrior system which serves as one of the main driving forces for most Iliadic heroes. He has redefined the code in such a way that this core value of connection is not only the framework that secondary values of honour and shame are hung on, but also can serve as the framework for emotional values, that are by-products of connection, to act as the hero's motivations for risking their life. This primary grief at the loss of Patroclus then leads to the secondary emotions of his famous fury and the desire to get vengeance against Hektor or die trying. He does mention the desire to win glory, but this in a minor capacity compared to his preoccupation with these other motivations.²⁶ However, he lays out to Thetis in his grief that he has been fully taken over by the need for vengeance. As well, importantly, this vengeance is against not the Trojans as a whole for their actions concerning Helen, but specifically against Hektor for his killing of Patroclus:

νῦν δ' ἵνα καὶ σοὶ πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μυρίον εἴη
παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο, τὸν οὐχ ὑποδέξεται αὐτίς
οἴκαδε νοστήσαντ', ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἄνωγε
ζῶειν οὐδ' ἄνδρεςσι μετέμμεναι, αἶ κε μὴ Ἔκτωρ
πρῶτος ἐμῶ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπείς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσση,
Πατρόκλοιο δ' ἔλωρα Μενoitιάδεω ἀποτίση.

But now it is such that you would have countless sorrows
in your heart for the son who will be destroyed,
never again will you welcome him home, for neither does my heart
compel me to live, nor to be among men, unless Hektor first
is beaten down by my spear, taking away his life, and he pays back

²⁶ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 55.

the price for the slaughter of Patroclus, son of Menoetius. (Il.18.88-93)

This chain of events, leading to Achilles being driven by grief, redefines the Iliadic heroic code to a state where glory is a secondary factor and vengeance is the result of a personal, emotional, and ultimately a connection-based response. This great affective response by Achilles pushes him to the limits of humanity and reveals the darker side of the heroic temperament, as shown through his slaughter of the supplicating Lycaon (Il.21.34-135) and the explicit desire to consume the flesh of his slaughtered enemy (Il.22.346-347).²⁷ Achilles has taken the form of Iliadic heroism based around *time* and *kleos*, rejected these values, and replaced them with those of affection and rage, and now has become animalistic in pursuit of his vengeance. This animalistic pursuit triggered by the loss of such a deep connection causes Achilles to then disregard any other connections that he may have. Lycaon is a prime example of this, we may expect a former supplicant, once again using an emotive supplicating plea, to affect Achilles, whose heroic worldview is dominated by connections, however, the rage based on his loss of his main connection in the Homeric world, means that he is immovable.

The last piece of Achilles' heroic identity is his ability to feel pity, the resumption of his humanity, and the return of the hero who values affective pleas above all else as we saw in Book 9. Achilles is ordered by the gods to return Hektor's corpse as relayed to him by Thetis (Il.24.65-76) and he immediately acquiesces to Zeus' demand (Il.24.139-140). Achilles however does not simply return the corpse of Hektor to Priam out of

²⁷ Nagy, 1979. pg.136-137.

obligation to the gods. He treats Priam as a guest friend through the ritual of a shared meal (Il.24.601-620) and even offers him a bed to sleep in (Il.24.635-648), shows him honour by allowing him to use part of the ransom gift to wrap Hektor's corpse (Il.24.580-581), and the two weep together sharing in their respective grief (Il.507-512). This final interaction of the *Iliad* between Priam and Achilles serves to return Achilles from his vengeful emotional state and allow us to see Achilles' final form of heroism. Zanker describes this final form by saying that "the place of honour in human relations is reinstated in a refined form. Social institutions are once again accepted.... Affective drives are in the foreground, especially pity, respect and affection, the significance of which is fully appreciated only in the experience of death".²⁸ I would expand upon this formulation of Achilles' form of heroism and his redefinition of Iliadic heroism by highlighting how honour in its refined form is only present in cases where there is a deep connection. Priam and Achilles belong to a community of suffering which allows a connection based on mutual respect to form, allowing honour to be reintroduced as a value of heroism.²⁹ However, this is not honour gained through physical prowess, but honour through respecting another's emotion and based upon a recognition of shared experiences. Achilles transforms Ajax's version of Iliadic heroism from one that prioritizes honour, (operating on a framework of connection) to a version where connection and emotion are the dominant values. Honour becomes a commodity that is variable in value but can be important in social interactions where it aids connection, and

²⁸ Zanker, 1994. pg.

²⁹ The term "community of suffering" comes from Rutherford as part of their discussion on the intersection of Tragedy and Epic. See Rutherford, 2001, *Tragic Form and Feeling in the Iliad* for their full discussion on how this shared moment of grief aids in bonding Priam and Achilles.

Achilles' form of Iliadic heroism is one where death and loss of connection is the key factor to push these non-honour based values to the forefront.

Achilles serves as the primary example of a conflicted hero in the Iliad, however, Hektor not only is the narrative foil for him but also allows Homer to examine how the foundational value of connection and the values of honour/shame conflict with one another. Whereas Achilles becomes disenfranchised with the Iliadic heroic values of honour and shame and eventually reintegrates himself into society with a redefined view of how connections and honour/shame intersect, Hektor never turns his back on the ideals of *time* and *kleos*. Instead, these two competing loves, the love of glory and the love of his family, while intrinsically are interconnected, still end with Hektor as a man who views honour and shame in the same terms as Ajax, where he is reliant upon the framework of connection for them, but he chooses to be an active participant in seeking those secondary values, unlike Achilles.³⁰

His competing loves and the interplay between connections, in this case familial, and honour are best highlighted in Book 6 when he returns from the fighting to find Paris, and he engages in conversation with his wife, Andromache. Homer describes the moment where they come together upon the wall above the battlefield, and they draw attention simultaneously to his son, who is intimately connected with Hektor's duty to the city of Troy, and his duty as the leader of the Trojan army:

ἦ οἱ ἔπειτ' ἦντησ', ἅμα δ' ἀμφίπολος κίεν αὐτῆ
παῖδ' ἐπὶ κόλπῳ ἔχουσ' ἀταλάφρονα νήπιον αὐτῶς

³⁰ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 66.

Ἐκτορίδην ἀγαπητὸν ἀλίγκιον ἀστέρι καλῶ,
τόν ῥ' Ἔκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι
Ἀστυάνακτ': οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἔκτωρ.
ἦτοι ὁ μὲν μείδησεν ἰδὼν ἐς παῖδα σιωπῆ:

She came face to face with him now, and following her was a handmaid
holding against her bosom the boy, a tender infant,
the well-loved son of Hektor, like a beautiful star.
And Hektor called him Scamandros, but the others called him
Astyanax: for Hektor alone guarded Troy.
Truly, he smiled in silence seeing his child. (Il.6.399-404)

In these lines we see the poet highlighting the tenderness of Hektor's family. The great defender of Troy is moved to happiness upon the sight of his infant child. Yet in the line preceding this happiness the poet notes Hektor's martial prowess, a key component of being a hero, and the means by which a man rose in the warrior society. This duality of a man intrinsically linked to the defense of his city as its greatest warrior, hence the broader connection of a hero to his general community, and a man who wishes to only protect his family is further explored when Hektor responds to Andromache's strategy regarding the fighting:

τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ:
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 ἠδ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ.
εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ τότε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν:
ἔσσειται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρῆ
καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἐϋμμελίω Πριάμοιο.

And great Hektor with the flashing helm answered,
“And I too wife, have taken thought of all this: but
I am terribly ashamed in front of the Trojan men, and the
Trojan women with the trailing robes, if as a coward

I shirk far from the fighting.
Nor does my spirit move me to this, since I have learned to be
brave and always to be first among the Trojans to fight
winning great glory for my father and for myself. (Il.6.440-449)

Hektor clearly refers to the matrix of honour and shame that has been well established as part of the Iliadic heroic code. As with Ajax he is consciously aware that he is operating within a community, and it is that community that bestows either of those values upon him. However, he also makes it explicitly clear that he personally wishes to be fighting and attempting to win great *kleos*. Hektor, unlike Achilles, appears to willingly buy into the honour portion of the Iliadic heroic code. He is not redefining the role of honour here, but there is a distinct tension between his desire for honour and his emotive responses concerning his familial connections as we see when he says:

ἀλλ' οὐ μοι Τρώων τόσσον μέλει ἄλγος ὀπίσσω,
οὔτ' αὐτῆς Ἑκάβης οὔτε Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος
οὔτε κασιγνήτων, οἳ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ
ἐν κονίησι πέσοιεν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,
ὅσσον σεῦ, ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
δακρύεσσαν ἄγηται ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας:

For I well know in my heart and soul that the day will come
when sacred Troy will be destroyed, and Priam as well,
and all his men, Priam who is armed with the good ashen spear.
But it is not the pain of the Trojans still to come
which is the object of my care, nor of Hecuba herself,
nor King Priam, nor of my brothers, many and brave,
falling in the dust by the enemy, but it is the grief of you,
when some bronze-clad Achaean leads you away weeping
and takes away your freedom. (Il.6.450-455)

Here we can see that Hektor has a deep emotional connection to both the larger community at Troy, his natal family, and his focus at the end of this passage on Andromache shows his connection with his own personal family. We may expect then

based on the model of Achilles' Iliadic heroism that the affective ties between Hektor and his wife would be strong enough to challenge Hektor's self-professed need to seek glory, however, instead it is his affective emotions that lead to him attempting to seek that very same goal. As we look at the end of the speech Hektor makes, we see these two elements of the Iliadic code mix together:

καί κεν ἐν Ἄργει ἐοῦσα πρὸς ἄλλης ἰστὸν ὑφαίνοις,
καί κεν ὕδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηΐδος ἢ Ὑπερείης
πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη, κρατερὴ δ' ἐπικείσεται ἀνάγκη:
καί ποτέ τις εἶπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσαν:
Ἔκτορος ἦδε γυνὴ ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι
Τρώων ἵπποδάμων ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.
ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει: σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος
χίτηϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ.
ἀλλὰ με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει
πρὶν γέ τι σῆς τε βοῆς σοῦ θ' ἐλκηθμοῖο πυθέσθαι.

And in Argos you will weave at the loom for another,
and regularly fetching water from Messies or Hypereia,
always against your will and strong necessity will be laid upon you.
And someone will say, seeing you pouring tears,
'The wife of Hektor, who was the bravest fighter of the Trojans,
the Tamers of Horses, when they fought for Ilium.'
So he will say, and now new grief will come to you
for the lack of such a man to ward off the day of servitude.
But let me be dead! and let a mound of earth cover me
before I hear your cries and before I hear you being carried off. (Il.6.456-465)

Hektor here is constrained by the honour/shame matrix of the Iliadic heroic code. He explicitly expresses his desire to avoid shame and consciously vocalizes the reward for him risking his life in battle. Yet, these desires are in conflict with his tremendous love for his wife. He vocalizes his fears concerning the fate of Andromache, showing that just the thought of what will happen to her when Troy falls brings him great grief. Not only does the thought of this bring him great grief but he prioritizes her above his blood

relatives, even his father, King Priam, who he names as the man who will share the glory that he wins on the battlefield. Therefore, in Hektor's worldview his concern over his wife, driven by his affection for her, and his desire to win glory are shown to be equal forces. There is an endemic tension it seems within the Iliadic heroic code between the foundational value of connection and the values of honour and shame. Thus, not only does the Iliadic heroic code showcase how these two sets of values (connection and honour/shame) are dependent upon one another, but how within the characterization of Hektor and Achilles how they are in tension. With Hektor his concern over the fate of his wife, ultimately leads to his stalwart defense of the city and by extension his family. In contrast to Achilles who restructures the relationship of honour/shame to connection, Hektor's affective ties are shown to reinforce the importance of honour/shame in his world. The love he has for his wife and son, and his knowledge of what will happen to them should he fail to defend Troy and fall in battle are key to understanding how he simultaneously does the most to keep the Achaeans at bay, and why he repeatedly flees in terror.³¹

In the end, Hektor's sense of shame at the thought of retreating from Achilles (Il.22.105-110) overcomes the affective pleas of his parents, including the invocation of his wife grieving for him (Il.22.84-90). His final actions of defense serve to highlight the complex way these values interact, namely that the hero, who leaves his family in order to defend them, is in fact committing a betrayal of them by leaving at all.³² Furthermore,

³¹ Kundmueller, 2019. pg.65.

³² Schein, 1984. pg. 74.

the conversation between Hektor and his wife shows that it is not Hektor's primary desire to abandon his wife and son in pursuit of honour. He views the defense of his family and city as being intricately bound with his obtainment of *kleos*. Therefore, while Hektor ultimately acts in such a manner that upholds value of honour/shame we see that the foundation of connection is highly prevalent, and Hektor's character and the intricacies of the interplay between these characteristics within him serve as the foil to Achilles' redefinition of heroism. Hektor is set up so we as the reader may expect him to also redefine heroism, but instead we see him conform to the Iliadic form of heroism. Therefore, Hektor allows Homer to explore the tragic hero figure, one who is both the primary warrior of society, and a hero who is deeply concerned with his love of family and only wishes to keep them safe and live a fruitful life with them.

The Iliadic heroes in both their uncomplicated (as seen in Ajax) and in their complicated forms (as seen in Achilles and Hektor) perish, showing that Iliadic heroism cannot survive beyond the medium of war, and the context of the *Iliad*. Homer is setting up the notion that it takes a different type of hero and heroism than the Iliadic form to survive the context of war and safely make it home. Chapter 2 will turn to examining how Odysseus, within the *Iliad*, acts both as an Iliadic hero, while his prioritization of connection in all instances simultaneously sets him apart from the other Iliadic heroes. This Iliadic Odysseus is the one who serves as our bridge between poems, aiding us in transitioning from Iliadic heroism as discussed above, to Odyssean heroism, as I will lay out in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2: Iliadic Odysseus

The *Iliad*, with the various forms of heroism it showcases through characters such as Ajax, Achilles, and Hektor, suggests that within this poem heroism is more flexible in its nature. Odysseus in the *Iliad* serves as a final example of a character that is unique in his heroism, and this is further represented in his evolution of heroism in the *Odyssey*. The chronology of Homer's epic poems suggests that there is something unique to the character of Odysseus, as he goes from secondary hero in the *Iliad* to the main character of the *Odyssey*.¹ As we will see when I examine Odyssean heroism, Odysseus is a figure of *metis* rather than *bie* and he is a hero greatly concerned with connections.² This holds true for his characterization in the *Iliad* as well, as he consistently shows care for the cohesion of the Greek warrior society, and the relationships that are part of it. He is regularly chosen for diplomatic missions such as the return of Chryseis in Book 1, and the embassy to Achilles in Book 9. In Book 2, he shows care for cohesion of the Greek army when they are on the point of breaking, and he speaks as the voice of the army when he mediates Achilles' reintegration into the warrior community in Book 19. These actions he demonstrates across the poem, showcases that Odysseus is a remarkable hero in his care for the connections around him. These traits of Odysseus in the *Iliad* may set him apart, but they do not exclude him from also showcasing the traits of the Iliadic warrior discussed above. Odysseus showcases his courage in battle when he is left alone on the battlefield (he deliberates on the Iliadic code at 11.403-410) and is one of the

¹ Concurring with scholars such as Kirk, 1985 and Heubeck, 1998 I am operating under the assumption that the *Odyssey* chronologically came after the *Iliad*.

² Finkleberg, 1995. pg. 2.

heroes put forth to fight Hektor in Book 7. However, while Odysseus does have a moment of solo battlefield prowess (Il.11.411-455), which seems to hold elements of an *aristeia*, he does not have a complete and lengthy *aristeia* in the *Iliad* such as Diomedes or Achilles.³ Odysseus' moment of singular battlefield glory is delayed until the end of the *Odyssey* and is one of the conditions to fulfill his homecoming, as I will argue in Chapter 3. However, before we reach the qualities that set Odysseus apart, I must show how Odysseus acts within the bounds of the Iliadic heroic code.

Odysseus acts in accordance with the Iliadic heroic code at multiple points in the *Iliad*. Just as the other Iliadic heroes he strives to excel in the medium of the battlefield, and nowhere is this more prevalent than when he is abandoned by his comrades and left to fight alone on the battlefield. In this moment Odysseus ponders the Iliadic heroic code and we are able to see how it influence his actions:

οἰώθη δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς δουρὶ κλυτὸς, οὐδέ τις αὐτῷ
 Ἄργείων παρέμεινε, ἐπεὶ φόβος ἔλλαβε πάντας:
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν:
 ὦ μοι ἐγὼ τί πάθω; μέγα μὲν κακὸν αἶ κε φέβωμαι
 πληθὺν ταρβήσας; τὸ δὲ ρίγιον αἶ κεν ἀλώω
 μούνοσ; τοὺς δ' ἄλλους Δαναοὺς ἐφόβησε Κρονίων.
 ἀλλὰ τί ἦ μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;
 οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι κακοὶ μὲν ἀποίχονται πολέμοιο,
 ὃς δέ κ' ἀριστεύησι μάχῃ ἐνὶ τὸν δὲ μάλα χρεὼ
 ἐστάμεναι κρατερῶς, ἢ τ' ἔβλητ' ἢ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον.

³ *Aristeia* is broadly used to describe excellence/prowess of an individual, and in particular the excellence/prowess of a Homeric warrior who is on a victorious rampage (Schein, 1984. pg. 80). Odysseus' fighting in Book 11 falls within the broad category of an *aristeia* but does not fulfill other more specific criteria that the *aristeia* of Achilles and Diomedes have. These other criteria include a description of the hero arming himself, turning the tide of battle single handedly (the tide only turns once Odysseus is joined by his allies, Il.11.485-487), and fighting over the corpse of the enemy that he just slew. Therefore, this fight by Odysseus appears to be a short *aristeia* that falls within the broad definition of the action, rather than the more detailed and complex *aristeia* of Diomedes or Achilles. For more on the criteria of an *aristeia* see Schein, 1984. pg. 80.

And then Odysseus, renowned with spear, was left alone,
for none of the Argives remained beside him, for fear had seized them all.
Then deeply vexed, he spoke to his great-hearted soul:
“What am I to suffer? It would be great evil if I would flee,
fearing the crowd. But it would be more horrible if I be captured alone.
For the other Danaans have been frightened by the son of Cronos.
But why does my soul converse with me?
For I know that cowards depart from battle,
and he who is best in battle, he must make a strong stand,
whether is to be hit or he hits another. (Il.11.401-410)

Odysseus’ intellect presents him with two options here. The first is to depart from the battlefield, fleeing the crowd. Even within pondering this option he characterizes it as an Iliadic hero would by immediately classifying flight as a great evil. He is cognisant of the shame that will come with flight. He also classifies capture by the enemy as evil, because for a hero this would be a source of great shame. He follows up the options that would bring him shame with the rhetorical question of why he even ponders this. He recognizes that the Iliadic hero must avoid shame and try to win honour, which leads him to the conclusion that the one who is “ἀριστεύησι μάχῃ” is the one who fights relentlessly on the battlefield. This short deliberation by Odysseus highlights that the main choice that the Iliadic hero faces every time they enter the battlefield is centered around honour and shame.⁴

Odysseus is further shown to be part of the Iliadic paradigm when he is one of the Achaean leaders that volunteers to face Hektor in single combat. Following the question

⁴ Odysseus is not the only hero who deliberates to himself on the battlefield. Menelaus, 17.91-105; Agenor, 22.550-570; Hektor, 22.98-130 all have similar self-deliberations, and with the exception of Menelaus they all decide to remain and fight. Gill (1996) examines these four deliberations in the context of heroic ethics and morality, pg. 60-93.

of who will fight Hektor, none of the Achaeans initially rise to the challenge. It is only after Nestor chastises them that a series of warriors volunteer:

ὣς νεΐκεσσ' ὃ γέρων, οἱ δ' ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέσταν.
ᾧρτο πολὺ πρῶτος μὲν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων,
τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Τυδεΐδης ᾧρτο κρατερὸς Διομήδης,
τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' Αἴαντες θοῦριν ἐπιειμένοι ἀλκὴν,
τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' Ἴδομενεὺς καὶ ὀπάων Ἴδομενῆος
Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντη,
τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' Εὐρύπυλος Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός,
ἄν δὲ Θόας Ἀνδραϊμονίδης καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:
πάντες ἄρ' οἳ γ' ἔθελον πολεμίζειν Ἴκτορι δῖῳ.

So the old man upbraided them, and nine in all rose.
By far the first that rose was Agamemnon, king of men,
and then sprang up strong Diomedes, the son of Tydeus,
after him the Aiantes, armed in fury,
and then Idomeneus and Idomeneus' comrade
Meriones, an equal to man-slaying Ares,
then Eurypylus, the son of shining Euaemon,
and Thoas, son of Andraemon and divine Odysseus.
All of them willing to battle godlike Hektor. (Il.7.161-170)

Among them, the last to volunteer is Odysseus. Nonetheless, following the paradigm of the Iliadic warrior in order to avoid being shamed further by Nestor, Odysseus volunteers placing himself in a position where he may be selected by lot to compete in single combat. Based on the reluctance of the heroes to volunteer, it seems doubtful that Odysseus actually wishes to be selected for this one-on-one fight. Instead, what he achieves by volunteering is a saving of face. Within the community of warriors that he relies upon for *time* and *kleos*, he must volunteer in order to avoid further shame, and to win potential *time*. This saving of face that Odysseus and the other heroes utilize here is

necessary due to the notions of honour/shame that are prevalent in Iliadic heroism and the larger Homeric society.⁵

Finally, after being sent a dream by Zeus (Il.2.110-141), Agamemnon beseeches the Achaean army to return home, and this results in Odysseus being implored by Athena to rouse the men and ensure that they do not retreat. She rouses Odysseus to action through the use of the Iliadic heroic paradigm, specifically utilizing the values of honour and shame. She says:

εὔρεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον
 ἔσταότ': οὐδ' ὅ γε νηὸς εὖσσέλμοιο μελαίνης
 ἄπτει, ἐπεὶ μιν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἴκανεν:
 ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:
 'διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
 οὕτω δὴ οἶκον δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
 φεύξεσθ' ἐν νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πεσόντες,
 κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχολὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιτε
 Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
 ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης;
 ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν, μηδ' ἔτ' ἐρώει,
 σοῖς δ' ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρήτυε φῶτα ἕκαστον,
 μηδὲ ἕα νῆας ἄλλα δ' ἐλκέμεν ἀμφιελίσσας.

There she found Odysseus, equal to Zeus in council, as he stood.
 He did not lay a hand on his well beached, black ship,
 for that distress had come upon his heart and spirit.
 And gray eyed Athena, standing near, addressed him,
 "Divine son of Laertes, inventive Odysseus,
 is it in this way you fling yourself onto the many benched ships,
 fleeing to your dear native land?
 And would you leave to Priam and Troy the glory of Argive Helen,

⁵ Scodel defines 'face' based on the work of Erving Goffman and politeness theory, and presents 'face' as another aspect of Homeric *time*. 'Face' is defined based on sociology and sociolinguistics as the positive self worth that everyone claims in social self-representation, and that others attribute to him or her. This definition of face has two sides to it: positive face is the positive self-image based on approval of the social group and negative face is an individual's claim to freedom of action (Scodel, 2008. pg. 13). For more on the intersection of 'face' and honour in all forms see Scodel, 2008. pg. 6-21, 30. When a hero is presented with a threat to their 'face' they must respond to it appropriately. Often this reaction takes the form of anger at those threatening their 'face', see Scodel, 2008. pg. 49-58.

for whom so many of the Achaeans died far from their dear homeland?
But now go through the Argive hoard, and do not rush forth,
but with gentle words restrain each man,
do not permit them to drag their rolling ships into the sea.” (Il.2.169-181)

After the standard format of address, Athena immediately plays on the ideas of cowardice and the shame associated with it. We may expect Athena, the goddess of wisdom, to not employ a standard honour/shame-based plea, but to the hero associated with *metis*, a plea grounded in logic and reason. However, Athena recognizes that Odysseus is firmly entrenched in the Iliadic warrior community and the dominant set of ideals that the circumstances dictate are the ideals of honour/shame. Therefore, she leans into the paradigm of the Iliadic hero, understanding that to be the most effective, rather than a connection- or *metis*-based plea. Through her questioning of the retreat, she reveals how eager the Achaeans seem to be to flee from Troy, and intimates that this practice is cowardly. If we read this with the Iliadic heroic code in mind she, in a tactful way, is reminding Odysseus of the shame that they will face if they choose to return to their homelands empty handed. She specifically mentions the action of leaving Helen behind as it serves to play on both values of shame and honour. Not only does it remind Odysseus of the price already paid by the Achaeans, but it serves to shame him even more at the thought of leaving behind comrades who sacrificed their lives in search of glory, that when the Achaeans leave they will not even receive it. In terms of honour, the mention of the glory left to Troy and Priam serves to remind him of the potential honour that the Achaeans, and especially Odysseus who is given the epithet *πολίπορθος* (the

city-sacker) (Il.2.278) ⁶, will obtain by staying and seeing the fall of Troy. The approach taken by Athena to rouse Odysseus to action, in order to prevent a full-scale Achaean retreat, falls squarely in the tenets of the Iliadic heroic code.

Once roused to action by Athena invoking the paired ideals of honour and shame (Il.2169-181), Odysseus himself uses the language of the Iliadic heroic code to convince both kings and commoners to halt their flight. To his fellow kings he says:

‘δαιμόνι’ οὐ σε ἔοικε κακὸν ὧς δειδίσσεσθαι,
ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς τε κάθησο καὶ ἄλλους ἴδρυε λαούς:

“Good man, it is wrong to frighten you like a coward,
But seat yourself, and settle the rest of your men.” (Il.2.190-191)

Here, just as in the appeal that Athena made to him, the chastisement is subtle. Due to the fact that Odysseus is addressing men who are of equal status to him means that he cannot outright insult them or their honour. Odysseus is aware that face is a highly important concept in this community, and he wishes to preserve his own while limiting any negative impact on the others.⁷ We saw in Book 1 the resulting argument that occurred when a hero’s honour was slighted. Therefore, Odysseus takes the tact of deference ⁸, he begins with a respectful greeting, followed by the remark that it would be wrong for him to chastise them, thus ensuring that the king he is addressing is shown the proper respect. However deferential this address is, it still contains a hint of criticism. By stating that it is wrong to frighten them into obeying, he heavily implies that their actions are worthy of

⁶ Haft, 1990. pg. 45. The epithet is proleptic whenever it is used in the Iliad, and it serves as the main reference to Odysseus role in the sack of Troy.

⁷ Scodel, 2008. Ch. 1.

⁸ Van wees, 1992. pg. 77, 88,115.

the sort of people who they are accustomed to force into compliance. Odysseus manages to walk a very tight line of deference, in order to avoid providing insult to their honour, while simultaneously calling them cowards and invoking their sense of shame, albeit in a tactful way.

His address to the common soldiery in order to prevent their retreat relies on the same honour/shame matrix that is applicable to all members of the Iliadic warrior community, even the *basileis*; however, due to their different places on the social hierarchy Odysseus is able to drop any semblance of deference. Therefore, he says to the commoners:

δαιμόνι' ἀτρέμας ἦσο καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἄκουε,
οἱ σέο φέρτεροί εἰσι, σὺ δ' ἀπόλεμος καὶ ἀναλκις
οὔτε ποτ' ἐν πολέμῳ ἐναρίθμιος οὔτ' ἐνὶ βουλῇ:

“Oh evil man, sit still! And listen to the words of others,
Those better than you, for you are unwarlike and without strength,
not one to be counted in war, or in council.” (Il.2.200-202)

Here the shame-based motivators are clear. He proceeds to call these men weak and not suited for war nor council, which are two of the main arenas where men were able to prove their prowess and consequently gain status.⁹ Just as before Odysseus is counting on shame being a primary factor in motivating the men to obedience and perhaps aggression which they can direct towards their opponent.¹⁰ Athena's address to Odysseus, and then his subsequent addresses to both the kings and the common soldiery

⁹ Zanker, 1994. pg. 11.

¹⁰ Van wees, 1992. pg. 94.

of the Achaean army show Odysseus operating within the Iliadic heroic code. The tenets of shame and glory are intertwined in his words, and they are effective motivators for both the common soldiery and the *basileus*.¹¹ Therefore, Odysseus at the beginning of the *Iliad* demonstrates that he understands the Iliadic heroic code so thoroughly that he himself is able to wield it to motivate others, and this conscious understanding and deliberation of the code means that he engages with it willingly, as we will see in Book 10.¹²

Odysseus' most prominent position in the poem is in Book 10, where he is chosen to go with Diomedes on a daring night raid of the Trojan camp. The book opens with Agamemnon and Nestor discussing who should be woken to discuss the night raid, and who should be part of it. In that passage (Il.10.108-113) six different heroes are named to be woken. However, Homer only discusses the waking of the two who will be chosen for the mission, Odysseus and Diomedes.¹³ Once the mission is laid out to the assembled men, Diomedes volunteers immediately, yet asks that another come with him (Il.10.220-226) and he ends up choosing Odysseus. The request for a comrade on this mission shows that connection is required for military expeditions even covert ones. Lacking the warrior community of the Greek army as a whole to bestow upon him *time* during the mission, Diomedes brings instead one comrade who is able to serve this purpose.

Diomedes also justifies his choice of Odysseus by saying:

¹¹ I have not dealt with the Book 2 episode fully here as I am working thematically through Odysseus' characterization. I return to the rest of the Book 2 episode later in this chapter in the context of Odysseus as the Iliadic hero who is concerned with the cohesion of the Achaean army.

¹² Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 74.

¹³ Odysseus is roused at Il.10.137-149 and Diomedes is roused at Il.10.150-179.

‘εἰ μὲν δὴ ἕταρόν γε κελεύετε μ’ αὐτὸν ἐλέσθαι,
πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ’ Ὀδυσῆος ἐγὼ θεῖοιο λαθοίμην,
οὗ πέρι μὲν πρόφρων κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι, φιλεῖ δέ ἐ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη.
τούτου γ’ ἐσπομένοιο καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο
ἄμφω νοστήσαιμεν, ἐπεὶ περίοιδε νοῆσαι.

“If indeed you urge me to choose a comrade for myself,
how could I forget god-like Odysseus,
whose heart and spirit are more zealous than other men,
in all deeds, and Pallas Athena loves him.
For if he would follow me, we would both return from the blazing fire,
for he excels in wisdom. (Il.10.242-247)

Here we see Odysseus praised by a fellow warrior, yet he is not praised in a manner that highlight his physical prowess. With the reference of him being a favorite of the goddess of wisdom as well as the explicit mention that he is being chosen for his wisdom we can start to see how Odysseus differs in respect to his fellow Iliadic heroes. Unlike Ajax and Achilles, it is wisdom, not physical prowess that sets Odysseus apart from his comrades.¹⁴ Furthermore, it is not Diomedes’ physical prowess that ensures the night raids success but instead it is Odysseus’ cleverness and trickery. First, he notices the Trojan spy sneaking towards the Achaean camp and his resulting cunning plan to capture him allows the pair to ensure that they will succeed and simultaneously prevents the Trojans from their own success (Il.10.338-348). Secondly, although Diomedes was the first man to volunteer for the mission, and choose Odysseus as his companion, we see that in the field Odysseus is the leader of the pair. When they come to the Trojan camp, armed with the knowledge they received from Dolon, Odysseus instructs Diomedes on

¹⁴ For more on wisdom as a heroic trait see Schofield, 2001.

the battle plan (Il.10.474-481), wielding the martial prowess of his companion as if it were a weapon. This instance highlights two things: that Odysseus relies on his cunning and tactical knowledge rather than physical strength in the field, and that he would prefer others to fight rather than risk his own life, showing a level of self-restraint that other heroes do not consider.¹⁵ Homer, just as they do with Achilles and Hektor, as seen in Chapter 1, is once again complicating the form of Iliadic heroism that they initially present.

Odysseus is set apart from the others as he uses his *metis* to accomplish the more traditional physical deeds that the Iliadic warrior is praised for. Just as Athena recognizes the medium he is operating in when she addresses him in Book 2, so too does Odysseus understand that medium that he needs to operate in here in Book 10. He must value *time* through physical prowess in order to gain *kleos*, but he can employ his *metis* to these ends. As we said above with respect to Book 2, the poet presents Odysseus as actively choosing to engage with the Iliadic heroic code, and this episode is a prime example of that. While he acts within its tenets and shows care for the values, the deliberation on, and conscious approach to, the code begins to set him apart from the other Iliadic heroes, while ensuring that he remains firmly within the warrior community that he is dependent upon.¹⁶ Overall, the episode in Book 10 begins to show the hero that Odysseus will

¹⁵ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 84.

¹⁶ Pache, 2000 discusses further the notion of Odysseus as being the hero who is hyperaware of his surroundings. They support the position that Odysseus is aware of the Iliadic conventions he must be following, and that he chooses to follow them in order to survive, but he is quick to discard them when he feels they interfere with his survival.

encompass in the *Odyssey*; a hero that is rational in his pursuit of glory; one that is defined by his cunning rather than his performance on a battlefield.

Having shown that Odysseus engages actively with the Iliadic heroic code and operates firmly within its boundaries, I can now move on to how he is marked out as unique among the *basileis* that lead the Achaean army. We see throughout the *Iliad* how he is concerned with the cohesion of the Greek army and is the one usually entrusted with diplomatic missions that are designed to repair connections that other *basileis* have broken. This unique designation of leader associated with connections given to Odysseus is apparent right from Book 1, when Nestor is advising Agamemnon to return Chryseis to her father. Nestor, in an effort to make an amends with the priest, suggests that they send Chryseis with sacrifices for Apollo to the priest and he suggests that one man, whom he characterizes as *βουληφόρος*, lead the mission:

νῦν δ' ἄγε νῆα μέλαιναν ἐρύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα δῖαν,
 ἐν δ' ἐρέτας ἐπιτηδὲς ἀγείρομεν, ἐς δ' ἑκατόμβην
 θείομεν, ἂν δ' αὐτὴν Χρῦσηΐδα καλλιπάρηον
 βῆσομεν: εἷς δέ τις ἀρχὸς ἀνὴρ **βουληφόρος** ἔστω,
 ἢ Αἴας ἢ Ἴδομενεὺς ἢ **δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς**
 ἢ ἐ σὺ Πηλεΐδῃ πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν,
 ὄφρ' ἥμιν ἐκάεργον ἰλάσσειαι ἱερὰ ρέζας.

But now let us launch a black ship on the shining sea,
 and swiftly gather the rowers for it, and let us set on it a hecatomb,
 and lead aboard fair-cheeked Chryseis herself.
 Let one prudent man be the leader,
 either Ajax, or Idomeneus or divine Odysseus,
 or even you son of Peleus, the most violent of all men,
 so that you may appease the far shooting god for us with sacrifices. (Il.1.141-147)

Nestor lists four possible leaders for this expedition that is designed to repair a broken connection between the priest of Apollo and the Achaean army. The scenario is dire as

the plague ravages the Greek camp and therefore the restoration of this connection is crucial for the army's survival. Odysseus' name is placed by Nestor at the end of the line, drawing attention to him. The rising tri-colon here also places Odysseus in the spot of emphasis, as the line builds to his name. This position of emphasis and the matching emphatic construction suggests that Nestor thinks Odysseus is most suitable for this sort of diplomatic, connection-based mission. Further, Odysseus is the only one given a positive epithet. Achilles in the next line is described by Nestor as *πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν* which I suggest is a negative attribute because of the argument that Achilles and Agamemnon are currently engaged in. Therefore, this characterization of Achilles by Nestor suggests that he views Achilles as too volatile to lead such an endeavour. The contrasting positive epithet of *δίος* for Odysseus becomes even more striking against the harsh character of Achilles. Odysseus appears to be thought of as someone who is even tempered and a strong leader for a peaceful mission. These ideas of Odysseus as the *basileus* who forges connections and as responsible for the army's cohesion is supported by him being chosen as the leader for this expedition and how he handles returning Chryseis to her father. Odysseus is named as leader after the sacrifices for Apollo are listed as they are loaded upon the ship:

Πηλεΐδης μὲν ἐπὶ κλισίας καὶ νῆας εἵσας
 ἦϊε σὺν τε Μενoitιάδῃ καὶ οἷς ἐτάροισιν:
 Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἄρα νῆα θοὴν ἄλα δὲ προέρυσσεν,
 ἐν δ' ἐρέτας ἔκρινεν ἐείκοσιν, ἐς δ' ἑκατόμβην
 βῆσε θεῶ, ἀνὰ δὲ Χρῦσηΐδα καλλιπάρηον
 εἶσεν ἄγων: ἐν δ' ἀρχὸς ἔβη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς.

The son of Peleus went to his tents and equal ships
 with his comrade the son of Menoetius.
 Meanwhile the son of Atreus launched a swift ship out to sea,

and chose twenty rowers for it, and drove on board
a hecatomb of cattle for the god, and led the
fair cheeked daughter of Chryses on board.
And many-minded Odysseus went as the leader. (Il.1.306-311)

We see Odysseus' tact and ability to navigate complex connections in action once he
actually returns Chryseis to her father. He says:

Τὴν μὲν ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ βωμὸν ἄγων πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς
πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐν χερσὶ τίθει καὶ μιν προσέειπεν:
ὦ Χρῦση, πρό μ' ἔπεμψεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
παῖδά τε σοὶ ἀγέμεν, Φοῖβῳ θ' ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην
ρέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν ὄφρ' ἰλασόμεσθα ἄνακτα,
ὃς νῦν Ἀργείοισι πολύστονα κήδε' ἐφῆκεν.

And many minded Odysseus led her to the altar
and he set her down in the arms of her father and he said to him:
“O Chryses, the king of men, Agamemnon, sent me
to lead your daughter to you, and to sacrifice a
hecatomb to sacred Phoebus on behalf of the Danaans
so that we may appease the lord,
who now sends much trouble to the Achaeans. (Il.1.440-445)

His prime objective is to repair two broken connections. The first through the safe return
of Chryseis to her father, and the second through their combined appeasement of Apollo.
Throughout the entire deliberation process over this diplomatic mission, and the
fulfillment of it, the poem consistently sets Odysseus apart as the ideal candidate for this.
He is vaunted as the leader who is able to undertake crucial connection-based objectives.
Odysseus' word choice demonstrates how he is the master of fixing the bond that has
been broken. Agamemnon is given the credit for the mission and idea because he was the
one who broke the bond in the first place. If Odysseus had said that Nestor had sent him,
which he did, or even that the Greek council had sent him, the specific bond that needed
repairing would not have been fixed. Odysseus instead demonstrates an awareness of the

connection that is broken, and carefully frames the reparation in order to fully repair that specific connection.¹⁷ The safety and cohesion of the Greek force is entrusted to him, and this idea that Odysseus serves as the Greek king who is able to and cares for the cohesion of the necessary community that Iliadic heroism is predicated on is carried over into Book 2.

Odysseus is not only shown to be following the Iliadic heroic code in Book 2, but his usage of it further suggests that he is the leader of the Achaean force that is able to maintain community cohesion. He is responsible throughout the book for the prevention of the disbandment of the Greek force at Troy. This suggests, just as with the Chryseis episode, that Odysseus holds some unique ability to forge connections and maintain them. This ability to rally the army, retaining the cohesion of the warrior community that is the foundation of the Iliadic heroic code, is apparent in Odysseus' treatment of Thersites. As Odysseus moves through the army imploring them to stay Thersites' rails against Agamemnon (Il.2.225-242), his words threaten to destroy the cohesion of the army that Odysseus is working to maintain. Interestingly, it is not Agamemnon who responds to this assault on his honour, but Odysseus,¹⁸ who chastises Thersites by

¹⁷ We will see this talent at identification of connections, and his ability to selectively repair them in Book 9 when he rewords both Agamemnon and Achilles speeches in an effort to repair that severed connection.

¹⁸ Scodel examines the Book 2 episode involving Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Thersites in terms of sacrificing face, as she sees Agamemnon sacrificing face in order to build moral, and this pays off when he redeems his *time* (Scodel, 2008. pg. 65). Scodel further comments on Odysseus role here, saying that he is acting as an agent of Agamemnon, allowing Odysseus to win *time* for himself while ensuring Agamemnon does not have to debase himself by trading insults with an inferior (Scodel, 2008. pg. 66). While I agree with Scodel that Odysseus is acting on behalf of Agamemnon I think we can extend Scodel's theory of 'face' in a slightly different direction. Odysseus with his hyperawareness of connection recognizes not only when he is experiencing a 'face-threat' but when others are experiencing a 'face-threat'. Therefore, in order to maintain the crucial connection between the commander of the Greek forces and his troops he intervenes and acts on behalf of the threatened connection. Saving Agamemnon's 'face' here is analogous with the

playing upon his lowborn status and shaming him with words, (Il.2.244-264) before he makes that shame physical by beating him (Il.2.265-269). This public beating and chastisement by Odysseus serves to unify the community and allow Odysseus the opportunity to address the whole group. Following the beating the community reacts:

οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἠδὺ γέλασαν:
ὧδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον:
'ὦ πόποι ἦ δὴ μυρί' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε
βουλὰς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύσσω:
νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν,
ὅς τὸν λωβητῆρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ' ἀγοράων.
οὐ θῆν μιν πάλιν αὖτις ἀνήσει θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
νεικεῖν βασιλῆας ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσιν.

Although being vexed, they laughed pleasantly at him,
and anyone would be seeing saying to his neighbour:
“O wow! Truly Odysseus has wrought infinite good deeds,
being good in council, and in marshalling in battle,
But now he has done the best thing for the Argives,
making that abusive speaker stop speaking.
Surely never again will his arrogant spirit set him
to quarrel at kings with dishonourable words. (Il.2.270-277)

The reaction from the warrior community is one that is in-line with the Iliadic heroic code. They align themselves with Odysseus upon whom they are bestowing honour by witnessing his actions in the medium of the battlefield and council. Further, they distance themselves from Thersites, upon whom they heap shame, and set apart as an outlier. The actions of Odysseus in shaming Thersites with a physical beating serve to unite the army, bonding them over a shared focal point of their collective shame, making those involved with the shaming a cohesive unit. Odysseus' actions also have the added effect of

maintenance of the cohesion of the connection of the Achaean army. For more on managing 'face' see Scodel, 2008. Ch.3. pg. 49-73.

breaking the tension that is growing within the army, providing him a period within which he is able to address them and assuage their fears (II.2.284-332). Odysseus ends his speech with a cry to remain at Troy and to obey the signs sent to the army by Zeus.

The reaction to his speech from the warrior community is as follows:

ὥς ἔφατ', Ἀργεῖοι δὲ μέγ' ἴαχον, ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆες
σμερδαλέον κονάβησαν ἀϋσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν,
μῦθον ἐπαινήσαντες Ὀδυσσεύος θεϊοιο:

So he spoke, and the Argives shouted greatly, and around them the ships echoed terribly from the shouting Achaeans, approving the words of godlike Odysseus. (II.2.333-335).

Gone is the fear and the impetus to retreat set in them by Agamemnon. Odysseus has taken the disparate pieces of the warrior community and returned them to a cohesive unit. Utilizing the language of the Iliadic heroic code, he plays upon the values of honour and shame to unite the Achaean army. Odysseus has the ability to maintain connections and reforge them when they are tested and broken. Just as with the Chryseis episode in Book 1, the poet places Odysseus at the forefront of an episode that revolves around the sundering of connection, and the need for a leader to reforge them. While Odysseus very much operates within the confines of the Iliadic heroic code, he is simultaneously set apart as a leader concerned with cohesion, and the maintenance of connections.

A further crucial instance where we see Odysseus come to the forefront is in Book 9 when he is part of the embassy sent by Agamemnon to appease Achilles' anger and have him rejoin the fighting. Odysseus is the first to speak of the trio and his plea to Achilles, just as when he addresses the warrior community in Book 2, is heavily based on the tenets of the Iliadic heroic code. He ends his speech with a clear honour-based plea

and the bulk of his words are centered around the various gifts that Agamemnon will give to him (Il.9.261-299). These gifts serve as physical representations of honour, the *geras* that serve as the materialistic component of the warrior's honour-based society.¹⁹

Therefore, between the list of *geras* that Odysseus offers on behalf of Agamemnon and the honour-based plea that ends his speech²⁰, we get yet a further example of how in the *Iliad* Odysseus is entrenched in the Iliadic heroic code. However, the honour-based plea that Odysseus ends his speech with, is not what Agamemnon asked him to relay as part of this embassy (Il.9.156-161). Odysseus makes the choice to omit the ultimatum that Agamemnon lays down, as he recognizes that this will further sunder the connection between Achilles and the Greek army.²¹ The text showcases Odysseus' concern with reintegrating Achilles into the community that he has left. Rather than try to repair the connection between Achilles and Agamemnon, Odysseus' plea focuses on the Achaean army as a whole:

εἰ δέ τοι Ἄτρεΐδης μὲν ἀπήχθετο κηρόθι μᾶλλον
 αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα, σὺ δ' ἄλλους περ Παναχαιοὺς
 τειρομένους ἐλέαιρε κατὰ στρατόν, οἷ σε θεὸν ὧς
 τίσουσ': ἧ γάρ κέ σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἄροιο:
 νῦν γάρ χ' Ἔκτορ' ἔλοις, ἐπεὶ ἂν μάλα τοι σχεδὸν ἔλθοι
 λύσσαν ἔχων ὀλοήν, ἐπεὶ οὐ τινά φησιν ὁμοῖον
 οἷ ἔμμεναι Δαναῶν οὐς ἐνθάδε νῆες ἔνεικαν.

But if the son of Atreus is still hated with all your heart,
 himself and his gifts, then pity the rest of the Achaeans

¹⁹ Schein, 1984. pg. 71. Zanker, 1994. pg. 127.

²⁰ See pages 25-28 in the discussion of Achilles form of heroism for more on Odysseus honor-based plea.

²¹ As in Book 2, Odysseus is cognizant of the potential 'face-threat' Agamemnon's words pose to Achilles. Therefore, with his unique awareness of connection and the intersection of 'face-threats' and connections he deliberately mitigates the danger to the already broken connection between these two men. We see him employ the same tactic when he brings Achilles' response to Agamemnon and the Greek council (Il.9.669-688). Again, see Scodel, 2008 for their discussion on 'face'.

distressed throughout the army, they will honour you like a god,
for you will win especially great glory from them
For now you may kill Hektor,
since he would come near to you having destructive rage,
for he says there is no one like him among the Danaans,
that the ships brought here. (Il.9.300-306)

As discussed above in Chapter 1, the *geras* no longer hold sway over Achilles, and Odysseus makes the connection-driven choice here to tell Achilles to discard this element of the Iliadic heroic code, and instead focus on the foundational value of connection. Further, once Achilles has declined the embassy and refused to return to the fray, when they return to Agamemnon and the council of the Greeks, Odysseus once again makes the tactical choice to censor Achilles' reply. Achilles refutes Phoenix by saying:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς:
‘Φοῖνιξ ἄττα γεραῖε διοτρεφὲς οὐ τί με ταύτης
χρεῶ τιμῆς: φρονέω δὲ τετιμῆσθαι Διὸς αἴση,
ἢ μ' ἔξει παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν εἰς ὃ κ' ἀϋτμῆ
ἐν στήθεσσι μένη καὶ μοι φίλα γούνατ' ὀρώρη.
ἄλλο δέ τοι ἔρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσι:
μή μοι σύγγχει θυμὸν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων
Ἄτρεΐδῃ ἥρωϊ φέρων χάριν: οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
τὸν φιλέειν, ἵνα μή μοι ἀπέχθῃαι φιλέοντι.
καλὸν τοι σὺν ἐμοὶ τὸν κήδεῖν ὅς κ' ἐμὲ κήδη:
ἴσον ἐμοὶ βασίλευε καὶ ἦμισυ μείρεο τιμῆς.
οὗτοι δ' ἀγγελέουσι, σὺ δ' αὐτόθι λέξεο μίμωνων
εὐνήν ἑνι μαλακῆ: ἅμα δ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι
φρασσόμεθ' ἢ κε νεώμεθ' ἐφ' ἡμέτερ' ἢ κε μένωμεν.

And then replying the swift footed Achilles said:
“Phoenix, old father, cherished by Zeus, in no way
do I have want for this honour. But I say I am honoured by the lot of Zeus,
which I will have among the beaked ships,
so long as in my breast and my knees my breath remains stirred.
But I will say to you another thing, and let it stick in your heart.
Do not confound my spirit with grieving and lamentation,
bearing pleasure to the hero, the son of Atreus.
It is not necessary to for you to befriend him,

lest you be hated by the one you cherish.
Should you do him wrong as he did me, for he vexed me.
Be a king as equal as me and share half the honour.
But these ones shall carry my message, but you will remain
to lay here on a soft couch. And at dawn we will take counsel,
whether to return home on our own or to remain.” (II.9.606-619)

And following Ajax’s plea, Achilles turns away his plea and states the message the
embassy needs to take back to Agamemnon and the rest of the Greek *basileis*:

τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς:
‘Αἴαν διογενὲς Τελαμώνιε κοίρανε λαῶν
πάντ’ ἅ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν εἴισαο μυθήσασθαι:
ἀλλὰ μοι οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλω ὀππότε κείνων
μνήσομαι ὥς μ’ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν
Ἄτρεΐδης ὥς εἴ τιν’ ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.
ἀλλ’ ὑμεῖς ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἀγγελίην ἀπόφασθε:
οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμοιο μεδήσομαι αἰματόεντος
πρὶν γ’ υἷὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος Ἴκτορα δῖον
Μυρμιδόνων ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθαι
κτείνοντ’ Ἀργείους, κατὰ τε σμῦξαι πυρὶ νῆας.
ἀμφὶ δέ τοι τῆ ἐμῇ κλισίῃ καὶ νηϊ μελαίνῃ
Ἴκτορα καὶ μεμαῶτα μάχης σχήσεσθαι οἴω. (II.9.643-655)

And the swift footed Achilles answering said:
“Ajax, sprung from Zeus, son of Telamon, king of the host,
all this seems to speak to my own soul.
But my heart swells with rage, whenever I consider these things,
how the son of Atreus caused indignity to me among
the Argives, as if I was some migrant to dishonour.
But you go and deliver my message.
For I will not think of blood-red war until the son
of wise-minded Priam, godlike Hektor,
comes to the ships and the tents of the Myrmidons,
slaying Argives, making fire among the ships.
But around my hut and black ship I say
Hektor will be checked, although seeking battle. (II.9.643-655)

Both of Achilles’ replies, in which he rejects the embassy’s message and offerings, serve
to further the divide between him and Agamemnon. He repeatedly insults the son of
Atreus and dwells upon the insult that he has received from him. If the embassy would

have returned to Agamemnon and repeated Achilles' words verbatim to the council, it would have caused a deepening of the rift between Achilles and the Achaean force, serving to be counter-productive to the embassies final goal. Instead, just as Odysseus does with his relaying of Agamemnon's speech to Achilles, he makes the choice to editorialize Achilles' response. He says to Agamemnon and the gathered council:

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:
 Ἄτρεΐδῃ κύδιστε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον
 κεινός γ' οὐκ ἐθέλει σβέσσαι χόλον, ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον
 πιμπλάνεται μένεος, σὲ δ' ἀναίνεται ἠδὲ σὰ δῶρα.
 αὐτόν σε φράζεσθαι ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἄνωγεν
 ὅπως κεν νῆάς τε σαῶς καὶ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν:
 αὐτὸς δ' ἠπείλησεν ἅμ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι
 νῆας εὐσσέλμους ἅλαδ' ἐλκόμεν ἀμφιελίσσας.
 καὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἔφη παραμυθήσασθαι
 οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι δῆτετε τέκμωρ
 Ἴλιου αἰπεινῆς: μάλα γάρ ἐθεν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
 χεῖρα ἐὼν ὑπερέσχε, τεθαρσῆκασι δὲ λαοί.
 ὣς ἔφατ': εἰσὶ καὶ οἶδε τάδ' εἰπέμεν, οἳ μοι ἔποντο,
 Αἴας καὶ κήρυκε δύω πεπνυμένω ἄμφω.
 Φοῖνιξ δ' αὖθ' ὃ γέρων κατελέξατο, ὣς γὰρ ἀνώγει,
 ὄφρα οἱ ἐν νῆεσσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔπηται
 αὔριον, ἣν ἐθέλησιν: ἀνάγκη δ' οὐ τί μιν ἄξει.

And the much enduring, godlike Odysseus replied:
 “Lordly son of Atreus, king of kings Agamemnon,
 He is not willing to quench his wrath, but he still is
 filled with more fury, and he refuses you and your gifts.
 And he commanded you to take counsel among the Argives,
 how you may save the ships and the host of Achaeans.
 But he himself threatened when dawn appears to launch
 his well beached ships, rowed on both sides onto the sea.
 And he said he would encourage others to sail home,
 since there is no longer any sign of winning lofty Troy.
 For far voiced Zeus, hold his hand above her,
 and the people are filled with courage. So he spoke. (Il.9.669-688)

Odysseus conveys the key points of Achilles' reply to Agamemnon, the lack of acceptance of the gifts and his consideration of departure is all still present. However,

gone is the fury and insulting tone that Achilles has. Odysseus instead presents the news in a tactful way, removing as much margin for insult against Agamemnon as possible, which would result in a deepening of this feud. Instead, on both ends of this embassy Odysseus tactfully changes the messages in a manner designed to further his chances of repairing the broken connection, or at the very least prevent it from worsening. As we have seen before, when Odysseus is highlighted within the *Iliad*, it is often in the role of forging connections. Odysseus is once again chosen to lead this crucial connection-centered embassy (II.9.168-172), and in his plea to Achilles he highlights the warrior community that Achilles has severed his connection to. While the plea is ultimately unsuccessful, once again we see Odysseus in the role of a connection forger, and as a leader who is concerned with the cohesion of the Achaean army, which serves as a major group connection for Iliadic heroism.

Finally, at the pivotal point in the war for the Achaeans when Achilles rejoins the army, and agrees to fight, we again see that Odysseus is present, serving as the mediator between Achilles and Agamemnon, ensuring the smooth reforging of their connection, which is emblematic of the larger connection between Achilles and the Greek warrior community. Once Achilles states his intent to accept Agamemnon's offered gifts, he immediately urges the group to return to the fray and do battle (II.19.145-153). Now, rather than Agamemnon responding to this acceptance, we see the insertion of Odysseus once again in the role of mediator, and as spokesperson for the entire army. He tactfully recommends that Achilles formally accept the gifts and Agamemnon swear an oath in front of the army regarding Briseis, and that the troops be allowed to eat first (II.19.154-

183). This incursion by Odysseus shows great care for the formality of Achilles' reacceptance into the warrior society and the need to publicly have this severed connection from Book 1 repaired. Odysseus is the voice of the larger community here and emphasizes the need for the connection to be truly reforged, for the good of the whole, rather than rushed as Achilles in his rage wishes it to be. Following this Agamemnon then speaks, reiterating what Odysseus has said regarding the army's need to eat, and the oath which he will swear (Il.19.184-197), and in his rage-filled response Achilles once again states his desire for battle immediately and wishes again to delay the reconciliation through the oath and gifts, and that these are things that can be done later in his mind (Il.19.198-214). As we have discussed in Chapter 1, Achilles in his rage no longer sees the need for the connection to the wider Greek warrior community, as his notions of heroism have shifted, and as he now prioritizes different connections that underlie his heroism. However, just as earlier, Odysseus is once again in the role of reforging connections: he interjects and ensures that Achilles and Agamemnon make the proper public amends, and that the army is looked after (Il.19.215-237). The exchange here, just as with the episodes examined above, serves to highlight Odysseus' role within the army as mediator, and the one concerned with the cohesion and connections of this warrior group. He consistently shows care for the foundational value of heroism, and actively works in many instances to aid in reforging broken connections. This attribute sets him apart from the other heroes who engage with the Iliadic heroic code, and will be further drawn upon, as he evolves into the Odyssean hero we will see in the *Odyssey*.

Odysseus within the *Iliad* serves to both support the Iliadic heroic code that I laid out in Chapter 1, as well as he stands out as a character that is concerned with the connections that underly that same code. We can see how he contemplates the Iliadic heroic code, and he utilizes it upon others. The language of honour and shame is heavily used when he enforces the cohesion of the army. Further, the theme of Odysseus as a hero of *metis* rather than *bie* comes to the forefront in Book 10, as we see the characteristic self-restraint and cunning that will define him in the *Odyssey* start to be on display here. The poet, throughout the entirety of the *Iliad*, sets Odysseus apart from the rest of the Greek kings, in respect of Odysseus responsibility in uniting the army. Right from Book 1 it is indicated that Odysseus is well suited to forge connections and aid in the repairing of broken ones. The episode in Book 2 where Odysseus convinces the army to forego retreat highlights the need for community connections among the Achaean force, and cements Odysseus as the leader who maintains that crucial connection required for Iliadic heroism to operate. The *Iliad* presents proleptically the traits of Odysseus that will dominate his character in the *Odyssey*. Just as with the proleptic epithet *πολίπορθος*²² we see how the *Iliad* sets up Odysseus as a special character, before the events of the *Odyssey* cement him as his own form of hero.

²² For more on how the epithet *πολίπορθος* is proleptic in the *Iliad*, as it looks towards the events related in the *Odyssey* regarding the sack of Troy and its relation to Odysseus as a hero in the *Iliad* see Haft, 1990.

Chapter 3: Odyssean Heroism

Now that we have a sense of how Homer presents a multifaceted view of heroism (which as I have shown they then complicate) I can now turn to how Homer presents a different medium and differing values to create another notion of heroism in the *Odyssey*, yet one that is still built upon the foundational value of connection. The *nostos* which serves as the central point of this epic, and the trial that Odysseus must endure in this poem, is predicated on a select group of fundamental connections. Mainly Odysseus' driving connection is to Penelope, but also to his son, father, and the larger community of Ithaca. However, throughout the retelling of his ten-year journey home Odysseus prioritizes different connections which in turn influence how he acts. As we will see, Odysseus' heroism is a slow evolution across his *nostos* from that of a Iliadic hero, into the new paradigm of the Odyssean hero. We see at the start of his departure from Troy his continued connection with his crew and warriors, meaning he pursues *time* and *kleos* through the medium of the battlefield and he is unable to restrain himself when the opportunity to shame his enemy arises. Yet as his journey progresses the connections Odysseus has to his crew weakens through conflict and through the deaths of crewmates. The loss of the warrior community that Odysseus departs Troy with is symbolic of Odysseus losing his Iliadic heroism, which is necessary before he can evolve into the paradigm of the Odyssean hero. Therefore, as he progresses along his *nostos*, we see him engage in more self-restraint and his prioritization of his existing familial relationships, culminating in the Calypso episode, where Odysseus crucially chooses Penelope over an immortal marriage. This final step demonstrates the completeness of Odysseus' evolution

from Iliadic heroism to a new Odyssean heroism, centered on familial connection and where the medium for heroism is the *nostos*. This then serves as the medium and form of heroism through which Odysseus gains his greatest *kleos*. Therefore, by following Odysseus' journey homeward through its chronological sequence of events, as he relates them, we can watch the evolution of Odysseus' prioritization of connections and consequently the evolution of the paradigm of the Homeric hero.¹

Odysseus serves as the narrator of his own tale when he is asked to regale the court of Phaeacians with his story. This narrative consumes the middle of the epic poem², and spans Book 9 through 12.³ The start of his story showcases how Odysseus, along with his crew, are still firmly entrenched in the Iliadic form of heroism,⁴ which is fitting as the narrative starts with Odysseus' departure from the sacked Troy, and as well we the reader now know that he played a major role in its downfall (Od.8.549-567). The first things that he and his men do after departing Troy is sack the city of the Cicones:

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν,
Ἴσμάρω. ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὄλεσα δ' αὐτούς·
ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες
δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης.
ἔνθ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ διερῶ ποδὶ φευγέμεν ἡμέας
ἠνώγεα, τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθοντο.

The wind bearing me from Ilium brought me to Cicones,

¹ For a different perspective of Odysseus as a passive hero who is heroic through his endurance of his trials in the *Odyssey* rather than an active hero such as the heroes in the *Iliad* see Cook, 1999.

² For more on the temporality and ring-structure of Odysseus tale, specifically during his retelling of his travels in books 9-12 see Bergren, 1983.

³ For the purposes of this study we will adopt the same logic as Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 103-104, that Homer always indicates to the reader when Odysseus is lying or misleading his audience. The lack of this literary signposting before Odysseus retelling of his journey means that we can assume he is telling the truth for this most complete version of his voyage.

⁴ See Chapter 2 for the full analysis of Odysseus' character in the *Iliad*.

to Ismarus. And I sacked the city and made an end of them.
And taking many wives and lots of plunder from the city,
I divided it up, so that no man would go home being deprived of an equal share.
Then I urged my men to flee on swift foot,
but in great folly they were not persuaded. (Od.9.39-44)

The brief account of this slaughter shows that Odysseus, upon departing from Troy, is still operating in the mode of an Iliadic hero. Upon landing in a foreign city, he follows the Iliadic paradigm by pursuing honour utilizing the battlefield, where he demonstrates his physical prowess, as a medium. Sacking the city and taking as many *gera* as he is able to increases honour both through the increase of physical representations of honour which he can take home to serve as tokens of his physical prowess, and through the removal of other's *time* by his conquest. Odysseus is living up to the proleptic epithet from the *Iliad* of *πολίπορθος* and continuing to act as if he is operating in the same heroic medium that he was at Troy. His connection to his warrior community is also noted here as he engages in discussion with them. Just as in the *Iliad* this community that Odysseus is connected to is crucial for his deeds to be witnessed and aid in bestowing honour upon him. However, as much as he is driven by a love of honour here, we also are able to see the other side of Odysseus.⁵ He uses his *bie* to destroy the city and gain his war prizes, yet he shows his *metis* and self-restraint here as well. As soon as he is victorious, instead of gloating and reveling in his accomplishment he recognizes the danger that his crew is in and advises them to flee. This self-restraint and characteristic wisdom, that the crew fails to listen to (due to their overwhelming love of honour), sets Odysseus apart from those warriors of the Iliadic heroic code. Further, even though we see much of the Iliadic heroic code in the

⁵ His actions here are reminiscent of *Iliad* 10. Chapter 2 explored that episode further.

way this episode plays out, the poet is already hinting at the dissolution of this warrior community. The lack of obedience by his crewmates signposts that while the actions may be Iliadic we are firmly within the Odyssean world. In the world of the *Iliad* such disobedience results in consequences, such as being beaten as Thersites was (Il.2.265-269). Here, while the connection to his crew still remains the primary means by which Odysseus sees himself obtaining *time* for his actions, the poet nonetheless places the emphasis on the individual, his characteristics, rather than the warrior society. As he departs Troy, Odysseus still engages in his love of honour, while his sense of self-restraint is starting to come into tension with this, and the connections that form his mobile warrior society are already starting to dissolve.

Following the destruction of the Cicones, Odysseus visits the land of Lotus-Eaters. This is a short interlude before the longer tale of the Cyclops' cave, yet it provides valuable insight into Odysseus' prioritization of connections. As his crewmates succumb to the effects of the Lotus flower (Od.9.95-97) Odysseus himself ensures that he retrieves them, and utilizing his connection to the crew, prevents the loss of any more members of the community:

τοὺς μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη,
νηυσὶ δ' ἐνὶ γλαφυρῆσιν ὑπὸ ζυγὰ δῆσα ἐρύσσας.
αὐτὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμην ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους
σπερχομένους νηῶν ἐπιβαινέμεν ὠκείων,
μὴ πῶς τις λωτοῖο φαγῶν νόστοιο λάθηται.

And I myself led them weeping back to the ship by force,
Dragging them under the benches, binding them in the hollow ship.
And I ordered my other faithful companions to embark with speed onto the swift ships,
So that no others would forget the journey homewards eating the lotus. (Od.9.98-102)

The emphasis placed by Odysseus in the recounting of this episode is firmly on his actions to save his comrades. He is of course acting in such a way that he may preserve the society that venerates him as hero, thus bestowing upon him *kleos*, but the concern over his companions highlights the fundamental value of connection. The heroism of Odysseus is nothing without the community around him, and as it has been dwindling, he cannot afford to lose any more. We also see in this episode the seeds of *nostos* becoming the medium for heroism, rather than the battlefield. The worry is that these companions will forget the purpose of their journey homebound, becoming deprived of the key connections that are central to a hero's life. The Lotus-Eaters are antithetical to the foundational value of heroism, and therefore are seen as a very serious threat to the group connections, as well as connections individuals may have with the ones they are trying to return home to. Depriving a hero of his connections means that they are deprived of their motivations within the honour/shame matrix. The episode with the Lotus-Eaters starts to lay the groundwork of how *nostos* and the connections of Odysseus are tied together, and how this will become the medium of *kleos* for the titular hero.

Following the brief excursion to the land of the Lotus-Eaters Odysseus arrives at the land of the mighty Cyclops. Here is where we see Odysseus indulge his heroic traits as an Iliadic hero pursuing honour through non familial connections for the last time and this episode serves to highlight the destructive nature that the love of honour can bring, as well as the tensions within the characterization of Odysseus. Further, we see the evolution of Odyssean heroism, as Odysseus sheds his identity as an Iliadic hero, and start to reclaim his new identity as an Odyssean hero.

Upon arrival to the island, Odysseus and part of his crew make their way inland to determine the inhabitants of this land (Od.9.156-76). There they discover the cave of the Cyclops Polyphemus and what follows is a battle of *bie* (personified in Polyphemus) and *metis* (personified in Odysseus). However, within this battle we see how Odysseus' character and the competing sides of this character are tested and set against one another. Upon their arrival to the island of the Cyclopes, Odysseus does not wish to seek honour through battle, rather he wishes to see what guest-friendships and connections he may forge in this distant land, and he desires to see what gifts (*geras*) the owner of the cave will bestow upon him (Od.9.228-229).⁶ This drive for *geras* causes him to ignore the pleas of his comrades and his premonitions of trouble, resulting in their capture (Od.9.213-215, 224-30, 239-44).⁷ Just as in the Cicones episode we see the dissolution of the warrior society that departed from Troy. The poet here inverts who is disobeying whom, the leader now pays no heed to his community. This is proleptic of Odysseus shifting priorities from leader of a warrior society to leader as king. However, just because we see the prioritization of the individual's wants and needs, we do not see a lack of care for the community the individual leads. Once captured and having witnessed his men being consumed, Odysseus' spirit is moved in anger and he ponders killing the

⁶ *Xenoi/xenia* is the Greek word that commonly is translated as "guest-friendship". The connotations of this word imply hospitality given from one party to another, often when one party find themselves visiting a new household. This *xenia* can then be transformed into *philos* and serve as a deep connection between families. These *xenia* connections further may stretch across generations as most famously seen in the interaction between Diomedes and Glaucus (Il.6.224-231), where their grandfathers' interactions in the past inform how they act in the present. Odysseus, once captured by Polyphemus invokes *xenia* in an attempt to save himself and his comrades (Od.9.259-271) relying upon this custom of strangers being able to form connections. While this ultimately fails, it serves as yet another example where connection, specifically *xenia* is utilized for the hero's own ends. For more on *xenia* and *philos* see: Konstan, 1997. pg. 33-37; Adkins, 1972, pg. 16-18; Herman, 1987. pg. 69-72.

⁷ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 110.

monster as it sleeps. This can be read as his *bie* of an Iliadic warrior overcoming his great *metis*. However, he manages to show his characteristic self-restraint, thus preventing himself from trapping himself and his companions indefinitely (Od.9.298-305).

Crucially, underlying both of these actions is Odysseus' concern for his companions. He is initially moved to great wrath, similar to Achilles, at the loss of these comrades, and further it is only the concern he has for the remaining members of his community that prevents him from acting rashly. He consoles himself by planning his revenge on the Cyclops and thinking of the glory that Athena will grant him for this deed (Od.9.316-317). Odysseus within this episode is almost overcome by his Iliadic impulse to pursue honour and gain glory through violence and physical prowess.⁸ His self-restraint is straining against this need for action, but through defaulting back to the foundational value of connection he is able to delay the immediate *time* and anger to Polyphemus' insults, meaning he places himself in a position to earn *kleos* long term.⁹ Further, Odysseus' interactions with his comrades here are proleptic of his future reclamation of the title of king. He no longer engages in council as he did in the *Iliad* but instead makes unilateral decisions based on his desires, yet he retains a care for the community that he is responsible for. These actions all contribute to Odysseus' evolution away from the warrior hero of the *Iliad* to the new Odyssean hero.

After resisting an immediate reaction against Polyphemus, Odysseus deceives Polyphemus by saying that his name is Nobody (Od.9.318-394) and then blinds him. The

⁸ For more on Odysseus balancing his *bie* and *metis* within the Polyphemus episode, and more broadly throughout Books 9-12 see Williams, 2018, especially pg. 2-8.

⁹ For more on the weighing of long term and short-term goals in respect to *time* and *kleos* see: Scodel, 2008. Ch. 1.

deception of Polyphemus is a crucial point in the evolution of heroism that Homer is presenting. In the *Iliad* we have seen how crucial it is for a hero to have their name associated with their deeds. Without a name and heroic identity there is no way for a hero to be immortalized through song giving them *kleos*. Odysseus with his great *metis* recognizes the need to efface himself if he is to ever fully reclaim his identity through his return home. This deception showcases not only Odysseus' *metis*, one of his defining characteristics, but also how we are seeing a shift away from connection within a group of fellow warriors to a connection with familial ties:

ὥς φάτ', ἀτὰρ οἱ αὖτις ἐγὼ πόρον αἶθοπα οἶνον.
τρὶς μὲν ἔδωκα φέρων, τρὶς δ' ἔκπιεν ἀφραδίησιν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος,
καὶ τότε δὴ μιν ἔπεσσι προσηύδων μελιχίοισι:
Κύκλωψ, εἰρωτᾶς μ' ὄνομα κλυτόν, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τοι
ἐξερέω: σὺ δέ μοι δὸς ξείνιον, ὥς περ ὑπέστης.
**Οὔτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα: Οὔτιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι
μήτηρ ἠδὲ πατήρ ἠδ' ἄλλοι πάντες ἐταῖροι.**

So he spoke, and again I gave him the fiery wine.
Three time I brought and gave it, and three times he drank in folly.
And when the wine went to the Cyclops' head,
then I addressed him with a soothing word:
“Cyclops, you ask my renowned name,
I will tell you this. But you must give me a guest-gift, as you promised before.
**Nobody-that is my name. They call me Nobody,
my mother and my father, and all my other companions.** (Od.9.360-367)

The effacement of his true identity with the identity of “nobody” is antithetical to the Iliadic heroic traits that Odysseus has demonstrated thus far on his adventures. He is erasing that heroic part of himself in order to secure his and his comrades' safety, and therefore, his heroism is evolving from the Iliadic paradigm into something new, yet still predicated upon connection. We see the seeds of this here as mother and father are the

primary connections listed, the familial connection becoming the dominant value of heroism, as opposed to the connections of a shared group of comrades, such as the ones dominant in warrior society.

Yet, having secured his and his remaining comrades' escape, his spirit roused in anger, he is unable to turn down the renown and glory that would come with having his name associated with this daring deed. As they sail away Odysseus calls out:

ὣς φάσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πείθον ἐμὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν,
ἀλλὰ μιν ἄψορρον προσέφην κεκοτηότι θυμῷ:
Κύκλωψ, αἴ κέν τις σε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
ὀφθαλμοῦ εἴρηται ἀεικελίην ἀλαωτόν,
φάσθαι Ὀδυσσεῖα πτολιπόρθιον ἐξάλαῶσαι,
υἷὸν Λαέρτεω, Ἴθάκη ἐνὶ οἰκίᾳ ἔχοντα.

So they spoke, but my heroic spirit was not persuaded,
but again I addressed him, angry in my heart.
“Cyclops, if any mortal man should ask you
about the shameful blinding of your eye,
say that Odysseus, city-sacker, son of Laertes,
who lives in Ithaca blinded it.” (Od.9.500-505)

Odysseus in his excited state allows his Iliadic self to dominate the other characteristics of self-restraint and deception that he exhibits in this tale. Just as a warrior boasts over their defeated foe on the battlefield so too does he boast over Polyphemus. By taunting Polyphemus with his full name, lineage and an epithet Odysseus is clearly seeking to be known by this deed. He wishes for the *kleos* of the deed to be properly associated with his name. However, this is not as simple as an Iliadic warrior boasting over his fallen foe. As discussed above, Odysseus required a self-effacement in order to defeat Polyphemus, and this reclaiming of his heroic identity brings with it new flavour as Homer continues to develop heroism driving it to the new Odyssean paradigm that Odysseus will embody by

the end of the text. The identity Odysseus is claiming is built around his family and community at Ithaca, and the one that now is driven by familial connections which will increasingly become Odysseus' driving motivator as his *nostos* continues, culminating in a second reclaiming of his own identity as a man, hero, and king when he recovers his wife and household at Ithaca.

However, this loss of self-control, where his need to boast over his enemy and claim this deed and the associated *kleos*, is the direct reason for his delayed homecoming.

For once Polyphemus knows the true identity of his blinder he prays to his father:

ὥς ἐφάμην, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι
εὐχέτο χεῖρ' ὀρέγων εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα:
‘κλῦθι, Ποσειδάων γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα,
εἰ ἐτεόν γε σός εἰμι, πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς εὐχεται εἶναι,
δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι
υἴὸν Λαέρτεω, Ἴθάκῃ ἐνὶ οἰκί' ἔχοντα.
ἀλλ' εἰ οἱ μοῖρ' ἐστὶ φίλους τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι
οἶκον ἐυκτίμενον καὶ ἐὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ὄψε κακῶς ἔλθοι, ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους,
νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης, εὖροι δ' ἐν πῆματα οἴκῳ.

So I spoke, then he prayed to Lord Poseidon,
reaching his hands to the starry heavens:
“Hear me, earth-shaker, dark haired Poseidon,
if truly I am yours, and you declare you are my father,
grant that city-sacking Odysseus, the son of Laertes,
having a home in Ithaca, does not return home.
But if it is his fate to see his friends and to return
to his well-built home and his fatherland,
let him return after a long time, after loosing all his comrades,
on the ship of another, and let him find calamity in his home.” (Od.9.526-535)

Polyphemus uses the exact same set of descriptors to curse Odysseus that Odysseus himself used to taunt Polyphemus. It is this curse and this specific moment that extends

Odysseus' voyage home, and this moment could have been avoided if his love of honour through defeating an enemy did not prevail during his escape.¹⁰ This is one last instance of an Iliadic heroic trait showing the destructive side of the heroic code. The Cyclops episode demonstrates many things in terms of Odysseus' characterization, and is a key episode where the evolution of heroism is displayed through the evolution of Odysseus' characterization. Odysseus' love of honour, and his pursuit of it via the paradigm of the Iliadic heroic code, is in tension with his characteristics of self-restraint and cunning. This desire to seek *geras* through connections highlights how regardless of medium, heroes always seek honour, in a variety of forms, through the foundational value of connection. This episode is representative of Odysseus failing to forge that crucial connection and serves to aid in teaching him how to interact in a society that is not the warrior community he is accustomed to. Just as he must shed his past Iliadic ways in order to achieve his *nostos*, he must relearn how to engage in a non-warrior society. Therefore, while Odysseus ultimately fails to forge a connection here, this mistake is crucial for his relearning, and for aiding him in successfully making connections further on. We see Odysseus undergo an effacement of identity and then a reclaiming of his heroic name, with clear links to familial connections denoting how heroism is evolving. Finally, the episode clearly delineates that if Odysseus continues to solely pursue honour, he may never get home. Homecoming and the pursuit of honour, through the means with which he pursued it at Troy, cannot coexist in Odysseus' new world.

¹⁰ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 111.

The paradigm shift from honour being found by/in risking one's life on the medium of the battlefield to honour being obtained through a *nostos* is highlighted in Odysseus' trip to the underworld.¹¹ Here Homer takes the best of the Achaeans in the *Iliad*, Achilles, and has him reject the entire Iliadic heroic code *kleos* based system that drove him. The poet does this not to make the reader view the character of Achilles in a new light, but to drive home how different the worlds of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are, and how the main protagonist of the *Odyssey* must evolve from the world of the *Iliad* to become the “best of the Achaeans” in the *Odyssey*.¹² The scene in question occurs in Book 11 when he journeys to the underworld in order to seek aid from the blind prophet Tiresias and there he encounters various mythological figures including the *Iliad*'s main hero. The following conversation occurs between the heroes of their respective epics, beginning with Achilles' address to Odysseus:

νῶι μὲν ὧς ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβομένῳ στυγεροῖσιν
 ἔσταμεν ἀχνύμενοι θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες:
 ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλλῆος
 καὶ Πατροκλῆος καὶ ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο
 Αἴαντός θ', ὃς ἄριστος ἦν εἰδός τε δέμας τε
 τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.
 ἔγνω δὲ ψυχῇ με ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο
 καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:
 ‘διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
 σχέτλιε, τίπτ' ἔτι μείζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μήσεαι ἔργον;
 πῶς ἔτλης Ἄϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροὶ
 ἀφραδέες ναίουσι, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων;’

Thus, we stood exchanging miserable conversation,
 grieving and shedding large tears. And then came
 the spirit of Achilles, the son of Peleus, and Patroclus

¹¹ I discussed this episode earlier in Chapter 1 in relation to Ajax and how his notions of honour/shame persisted even in death. pg. 17-20.

¹² Nagy, 1979. pg. 26-36.

and blameless Antiochus, and Ajax, who was the best
in form and bodily frame of the other Achaeans,
after the peerless son of Peleus.
And the swift footed son of Aeacus knew me,
and he addressed me with winged words, weeping.
“Royal son of Laertes, inventive Odysseus, unflinching man,
what deed still greater do you intend in your heart?
Why do you venture down to Hades,
where the senseless corpses dwell, phantoms of men overworked?” (Od.11.465-477)

The poet begins by reminding us of Achilles’ martial prowess and the significance of this as it enabled him to bear the epithet “best of the Achaeans” as he approaches. Achilles then questions why Odysseus would be making a journey into the underworld. The phrasing here with reference to a “greater deed” and the word choice of *μεῖζον* (a comparative) makes it seem to me that Achilles is making a direct reference here to Odysseus’ role in the sack of Troy. The implication with this reference being that with his deeds at Troy, Odysseus should have no reason to undertake more daring deeds. He has already accumulated enough *time* that his *kleos* should be everlasting. However, due to the paradigm shift we see unfolding, the *kleos* he has accumulated in the medium of the battlefield does not carry the same significance. Instead, as the medium shifts to that of a *nostos* his honour and glory are tied to the connections he has with his wife and son, and this trip to the underworld is a necessary step in accomplishing these heroic deeds in the new medium. Odysseus himself recognizes the shift in heroic medium in his reply to Achilles, stating he needed to descend to the underworld in order to return home to

Ithaca:

ὥς ἔφατ’, ἀτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον:
‘ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ Πηλεΐδος υἱέ, μέγα φέρτατ’ Ἀχαιῶν,
ἦλθον Τειρεσίαο κατὰ χρέος, εἴ τινα βουλήν
εἴποι, ὅπως Ἰθάκην ἐς παιπαλόεσσιν ἰκοίμην:

οὐ γάρ πω σχεδὸν ἦλθον Ἀχαιῖδος, οὐδέ πω ἀμῆς
γῆς ἐπέβην, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχω κακά. σεῖο δ', Ἀχιλλεῦ,
οὗ τις ἀνὴρ προπάροιθε μακάρτατος οὔτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω.
πρὶν μὲν γάρ σε ζῶν ἐτίομεν ἴσα θεοῖσιν
Ἄργεῖοι, νῦν αὖτε μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσιν
ἐνθάδ' ἑών: τῷ μὴ τι θανῶν ἀκαχίζευ, Ἀχιλλεῦ.

So he spoke, and I gave answer to him:
“O Achilles, son of Peleus, greatest of the Achaeans,
I came to consult Tiresias, if he would say any counsel,
so that I could return home to rugged Ithaca.
For I have not yet come near Achaea,
nor yet set foot upon our land, but I only encounter misfortune.
But you, Achilles, there is no man more blessed than you,
nor will there be one afterwards.
For before, when you were alive, we Argives honoured you as much as a god,
and now that you are here, you are the greatest ruler among the dead,
therefore do not grieve that you are dead, Achilles.” (Od.11.478-485)

Further, this reply to Achilles deals with the heroic shift that Odysseus is undergoing, we see the heroic values of the *Odyssey* coming into tension with the heroic values of the *Iliad*. Odysseus simultaneously reinforces the medium shift with his drive to return home taking the primary place of importance to him as a hero, yet unable to completely separate himself from the Iliadic world, he also exhorts Achilles, who is being paid the proper *kleos* for his actions in the *Iliad*. Achilles' response then to this praise is what fully cements the heroic paradigm shift that we are undergoing with Odysseus. Achilles, rather than delighting in the *kleos* he has achieved, as we would expect any Iliadic hero to do, instead states:

ὣς ἐφάμην, ὁ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε:
‘μὴ δὴ μοι θάνατόν γε παραύδα, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ.
βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἑὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλω,
ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίωτος πολὺς εἴη,
ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.
ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τοῦ παιδὸς ἀγαθοῦ μῦθον ἐνίσπες,
ἢ ἔπετ' ἐς πόλεμον πρόμος ἔμμεναι, ἦε καὶ οὐκί.

εἰπέ δέ μοι Πηληϊός ἀμύμονος, εἴ τι πέπυσσαι,
ἢ ἔτ' ἔχει τιμὴν πολέσιν μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσιν,
ἢ μιν ἀτιμάζουσιν ἀν' Ἑλλάδα τε Φθίην τε,
οὐνεκά μιν κατὰ γῆρας ἔχει χεῖράς τε πόδας τε.
οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπαρωγὸς ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἡελίοιο,
τοῖος ἐὼν, οἷός ποτ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ
πέφνον λαὸν ἄριστον, ἀμύνων Ἀργείοισιν:
εἰ τοιόσδ' ἔλθοιμι μίνυνθά περ ἐς πατέρος δῶ:
τῷ κέ τεω στύξαιμι μένος καὶ χεῖρας ἀάπτους,
οἷ κείνον βιόωνται ἐέργουσίν τ' ἀπὸ τιμῆς.

Thus, I spoke, but he answered me immediately,
“Do not seek to console me about Death, radiant Odysseus.
I wish I was a slave to another, working the soil
for some man without a lot, who does not have much livelihood,
rather than to rule over all the dead who have wasted away.
But come, tell me of my noble son,
whether he followed to war to be among the leaders, yes or no?
But tell me of noble Peleus, if you heard any news of him,
if he still holds honour among the Myrmidon people,
or do they dishonour him in Hellas and Phthia,
because old age grasps his hands and feet.
For I am unable to bear him aid under the light of the sun,
such as I was, such as I struck down the best men at wide Troy,
defending the Argives. If I were able to come to my fathers' home,
as the man I was for a short time. I would make my force,
and my invincible hands hated to those men,
who constrain him and keep him from his honour.” (Od.11.486-503)

Instead of agreeing with Odysseus that he received everything he wanted, *time* and *kleos*, Achilles expresses the wish that he would do anything to be alive again, even if it meant being a slave. This preference to choose a long life, even one of servitude, over a premature death, the condition for Achilles receiving such high honour and glory in the *Iliad*, shows that in the world of the *Odyssey* glory through battle no longer serves as the highest good and the value that all “heroes” should be striving for.¹³ What follows this

¹³ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 56.

declaration is an appeal for news of his own family. The prioritization of connections has shifted away from the warrior society unit that conferred upon Achilles so much *time* and *kleos* in the *Iliad* to care about the connections within the family unit. Achilles specifically asks about his father and son in terms of the Iliadic heroic code, but this is to be expected. He is unable to be completely separated from the world of the *Iliad* as it is primarily his story. Therefore, while he does speak in the language of achieving honour through battle and appears to be concerned with the honour of both Peleus and Neoptolemus, the fact that his concern is for family and their exploits rather than news of his deeds spreading among the Achaean world, is indicative that Odyssean world that he is now a part of is still based around an honour/shame matrix, but the medium has changed, and the connections which are prioritized have changed from that of the warrior community and fellow soldier to the familial. This conversation between the two heroes of their respective stories concretely demonstrates the shift in heroic values between the two Homeric epics. Odysseus' journey up until this point has been representative of the evolution of heroism from the Iliadic ideal into the Odyssean form, which now solidifies and takes over as the paradigm of heroism within this episode. Achilles, who in the *Iliad* ends up with a refined sense of honour,¹⁴ no longer cares for his own glory at all, but would trade it all for longevity and familial ties. Odysseus now fully represents how these new prioritized connections, the family, and the medium of the *nostos* has become the path upon which heroes obtain *kleos*.

¹⁴ See pages 21-34 for analysis of Achilles form of heroism.

The last stop that Odysseus has before arriving to the Phaeacians, and the location he remains for the longest stretch of time, is the island of Ogygia, home of the Goddess Calypso. Odysseus does not regale the court of the Phaeacians with this part of his adventure as it is where we are first introduced to his plight back in Book 5, so in order to avoid repetition the poet has him claim that he does not want to cover material he has already spoken about (Od.12.447-453). However, we must examine his time on Ogygia as chronologically within his adventures it is the second last place he visits before making it home. Odysseus' desire for his home and family is nowhere more prevalent than on this island. His primary drive is to achieve a *nostos*, and to reclaim his identity as husband to Penelope and ruler of Ithaca. Nowhere is this exemplified more than in his conversations with Calypso.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,
τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἤρχε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων:
‘διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
οὐτῶ δὴ οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
αὐτίκα νῦν ἐθέλεις ἰέναι; σὺ δὲ χαῖρε καὶ ἔμπηξ.

When they had their fill of food and drink,
Calypso was the first one to speak, for she was a goddess:
“Royal son of Laertes, inventive Odysseus,
do you still wish to depart immediately,
returning to your beloved home and your native land? (Od.5.201-205)

The immortal goddess begins by questioning our hero whether he still wishes to depart from her island, implying that he has attempted to leave at a previous time, and that this desire for home is something that is not new but ongoing during his time on the island. In fact, prior to this conversation Odysseus is shown as weeping by the shore, overcome with grief thinking about home (Od.5.151-159). This characterization, when we examine

Odysseus' journey chronologically, is consistent with his newly prioritized connection to his family and his homeland. Calypso recognizes that he does not wish to stay with her, and she attempts to persuade him with two different arguments:

εἶ γε μὲν εἰδείης σῆσι φρεσὶν ὅσσα τοι αἴσα
κήδε' ἀναπλῆσαι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι,
ἐνθάδε κ' αὖθι μένων σὺν ἐμοὶ τόδε δῶμα φυλάσσοις
ἀθάνατός τ' εἴης, ἰμειρόμενός περ ἰδέσθαι
σὴν ἄλοχον, τῆς τ' αἰὲν ἐέλδεται ἥματα πάντα.
οὐ μὲν θὴν κείνης γε χερείων εὐχομαι εἶναι,
οὐ δέμας οὐδὲ φύην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶς οὐδὲ ἕοικεν
θνητὰς ἀθανάτησι δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἐρίζειν.'

Farewell and all the best! Indeed, if you knew in your heart what things are destined to fill you up before you come to your fatherland, perhaps you may remain here in this place, and keep this house with me, for you would be immortal, longing to see your wife, hoping for her always, day after day. For I profess not to be inferior to her, not in form, nor in stature, how does it seem right for a mortal to match a goddess in form and beauty?" (Od.5.206-213)

First, she reminds him of the troubles that still await him both on the voyage home and those that await him in his fatherland. This preliminary reminder of his coming hardship serves to then segue into the argument that if he does stay, he can become immortal and live for eternity with her by his side. Here she brings Penelope into the argument, asking how a mere mortal could ever equal a goddess and this is where her argumentation fails. Penelope serves as the embodiment of Odysseus' prime desire now, she represents the home, the fatherland, and the family that he left behind as he sailed to Troy numerous years ago. She reminds Odysseus of all that he is striving for, and the temptation of immortality holds no sway upon our hero. The foundational connection to Penelope, and the honour he will obtain through his reunion with her and through the reclamation of his

household, is a stronger motivator than immortality. Further, immortality on Ogygia would result in Odysseus' obscurity. There is no *kleos* to be had in accepting Calypso's offer. The offer of immortality removes his heroic medium of the *nostos*, removes the foundational value of connection, and removes his opportunities to achieve the sufficient honour to receive *kleos*. Calypso is not simply offering immortality, she is offering a severing of Odysseus from the heroic, connected world. Odysseus is very careful in his response. He says:

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς:
 'πότνα θεά, μή μοι τόδε χῶεο: οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς
 πάντα μάλ', οὔνεκα σεῖο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια
 εἶδος ἀκιδνοτέρη μέγεθός τ' εἰσάντα ιδέσθαι:
 ἢ μὲν γὰρ βροτός ἐστι, σὺ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως.
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἐθέλω καὶ ἐέλδομαι ἤματα πάντα
 οἴκαδέ τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἦμαρ ιδέσθαι.
 εἰ δ' αὖ τις ραίησι θεῶν ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ,
 τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσι νύχθ' ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν:
 ἦδη γὰρ μάλα πολλὰ πάθον καὶ πολλὰ μόγησα
 κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ: μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω.'
 ὡς ἔφατ', ἠέλιος δ' ἄρ' ἔδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν:
 ἐλθόντες δ' ἄρα τὴν γαίην μυχῷ σπείους γλαφυροῖο
 τερπέσθη φιλότητι, παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες.

And Odysseus of many counsels answered,
 "O great goddess, do not be angry with me.
 For I myself know this especially well,
 that thoughtful Penelope is weaker in beauty and stature.
 For she is mortal, and you are immortal and ageless.
 But nonetheless I wish daily and I long to return to my home
 and to say the day of my homecoming.
 And if any of the gods will break me again on the wine dark sea,
 I will suffer it, holding in my chest a heart patient in woe.
 For already I have especially suffered and toiled much
 at sea and in war, let this be added to that!"
 So he spoke, and the sun sank and darkness came;
 and now following they went to the deepest hollow of the cave,
 and took delight in love, staying with one another. (Od.5.214-227).

Odysseus answers that while Penelope is unequal to the goddess in form and stature, he still longs for home. What he does not mention in his answer to Calypso is that Penelope does not need to be a match to a goddess in form or stature, instead she excels in her actions, words, and thoughts, which proves that she is a woman of courage, intelligence, and self-restraint, thus making her a perfect companion to the inventive Odysseus.¹⁵

Therefore, the foundational value of connection, the prioritization of his connection to his wife, is enough motivation for Odysseus to turn down the promise of immortality. He states that he is willing to suffer even more than he already has in order to achieve this *nostos*, thus, family and honour through family has clearly taken precedence as the highest good for Odysseus. Further, the traits that allow him to become the paradigm of the Odyssean hero are on display. Earlier in his voyage as he escaped Polyphemus his self-restraint was able to be overcome by his need to have his name associated with his violent, Iliadic heroic deeds. Since he has paid the price for not acting in a way that is self-restrained, Odysseus is able to turn down potential enticements that may have earlier in his journey caused him delay.¹⁶ The evolution of heroism from that of the Iliadic hero to the new Odyssean hero is present. It has taken his entire journey, but this last refusal of Calypso, cements the importance of *nostos* and the prioritization of family in this new heroic paradigm. Odysseus is not gaining *kleos* through his physical prowess on a battlefield, but through his endurance of a long and challenging *nostos*.

¹⁵ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 155. For more on Penelope and her role as the heart of Odysseus homecoming see Chapter 6 of Kundmueller's work.

¹⁶ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 130.

Finally, we must turn to how Odysseus acts upon returning home. One may think that he reverts to the Iliadic paradigm of heroism, but there are three main characteristics that we can look at to see how even when he is reintegrated into the medium of the battlefield, the core heroic connection of his family is still present, and that his actions in battle are ultimately in defense of these connections. These three characteristics are: his constant rejoicing at re-establishing relationships with members of his family, the pain that he feels at the destruction of his household and deceit towards his wife, and finally the shutting off his home and the typical medium of battle from the public sphere where *kleos* is gained. Odysseus reunites with three major familial roles, son, wife, and father as well as some key members of his household, during the course of reclaiming his home. He expresses varying levels of emotion to each of these reunions, but they all have the common thread of emphasizing Odysseus' prioritization of familial connection over any other. The key connection that serves as the heart of his homecoming is Odysseus' reunion with Penelope, the reunions with his son and father then serve to flesh out the family dynamic he is reclaiming, and finally his reunions with his slaves serve to showcase the care Odysseus has for the physical elements of his *nostos*.

Penelope is the most important reunion that Odysseus has upon his return home. She has been serving as protector of his *oikos* in his long absence and her characteristics mirror his, making their marriage one of *ὁμοφροσύνη*.¹⁷ The matching *kleos* and characteristics of this marriage, lead to a deeply emotive response in their reunion.

¹⁷ Bolmarcich, 2001.

Penelope, stuck in the household without her husband, explicitly states that he is the cause of her glory multiple times. Twice in response to two different queries she states:

τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα περίφρων Πηνελόπεια:
'Εὐρύμαχ', ἧ τοι ἐμὴν ἀρετὴν εἶδος τε δέμας τε
ᾠλεσαν ἀθάνατοι, ὅτε Ἴλιον εἰσανέβαινον
Ἀργεῖοι, μετὰ τοῖσι δ' ἐμὸς πόσις ἦεν Ὀδυσσεύς,
εἰ κείνός γ' ἐλθὼν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολεύοι,
μειζόν κε κλέος εἶη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτως.

And then thoughtful Penelope answered,
“Eurymachus, my virtue of both form and body
the immortals destroyed when the Argives headed for Ilium
and my husband Odysseus went with them.
If that man having come would care for my life,
my fame would be greater and fairer. (Od.18.250-255)

This formulaic response that is identical in both cases (Od. 18.250-255 and Od. 19.123-128), with the exception of the vocative address, draws emphasis to the close bond between Odysseus and his wife, as well as the close ties between *kleos* and the family. It is the completion of her partnership with her husband and his presence in the home that gives Penelope *kleos*, and it is her actions protecting the *oikos* in Odysseus absence that protects his honour as well. ¹⁸ By mirroring the *metis* and other characteristic traits of Odysseus in the defense of her household, Penelope becomes worthy of *kleos* herself. ¹⁹ Agamemnon explicitly states that Penelope will receive *kleos* for her efforts in protecting the household in Book 24:

‘ὄλβιε Λαέρταο πάϊ, πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
ἧ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐκτήσω ἄκοιτιν.
ὡς ἀγαθαὶ φρένες ἦσαν ἀμύμονι Πηνελοπέει,

¹⁸ Cairns, 1993. pg. 120-121

¹⁹ Penelope’s utilization of weaving to trick the suitors (Od. 2.94-110) is a key example of her employing *metis* in order to defend her *oikos*.

κούρη Ἰκαρίου: ὡς εὖ μέμνητ' Ὀδυσῆος,
ἀνδρὸς κουριδίου: τῷ οἱ κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται
ἧς ἀρετῆς, τεύξουσι δ' ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδὴν
ἀθάνατοι χαρίεσσαν ἐχέφρονι Πηνελόπειῃ

Oh blest son of Laertes, crafty Odysseus,
for you acquired a greatly virtuous wife.
As good prudence was in Penelope's heart,
The daughter of Icarus, for she remembered Odysseus well,
Her wedded husband. The glory of her virtue will not perish,
and the immortals will make a beautiful song upon earth
for the prudent Penelope. (Od.24.192-198)

It is crucial that Agamemnon is the one that bestows *kleos* upon Penelope, as he is both a former Iliadic hero, and a hero who has had a failed homecoming himself. Agamemnon's journey home and his disastrous reunion with Clytemnestra is consistently set up across the *Odyssey* as the warning tale of a failed *nostos*.²⁰ Through Agamemnon's attribution of *kleos* to Penelope, the poem once again highlights the new medium of importance for heroism, the medium of the *oikos* and family. The former Iliadic hero recognizes the valorized characteristics of Odyssean heroism, and the medium that they are expressed within. Penelope's actions and characteristics that gain her *kleos* are similar to Odysseus' in his role as the Odyssean hero. He delights in her deceits of the suitors (Od.18.281-283), and she showcases greater *metis* than his when she deceives him regarding their marriage bed (Od.23.176-80). Further, once they have been reunited, before going to bed together Penelope restrains her desire, just as Odysseus has done so many times, in order to learn about his future trials (Od.23.257-262).²¹ This mirroring of personality is what

²⁰ Od.1.26-43, Zeus tells the story of Aegisthus; Od.11.440-446, Agamemnon warns Odysseus to be wary upon returning home.

²¹ Schein, 1995. pg. 22

allows their marriage to be classified as *ὁμοφροσύνη* and is the key to Odysseus having a successful *nostos*.

Due to their matching relationship, and interconnected *kleos*, we are able to read this as supportive of the Odyssean paradigm of heroism, where the foundational connection is familial and the *nostos* including the reclamation of the household is the medium through which *kleos* is obtained. In this reunion we see the pattern of Odysseus initially in disguise being pained, followed by an emotional reunion, with both emotive responses designed to highlight the hero's deep attachment to his household and family. Just as we will see with Telemachus, Odysseus must control his emotions when he meets with his wife and due to his disguise, he is forced to lie to her about his identity and the fate of Odysseus which causes him great pain. After his deception he must restrain his emotions:

αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
θυμῷ μὲν γοόωσαν ἔην ἑλέαιρε γυναῖκα,
ὀφθαλμοὶ δ' ὡς εἰ κέρα ἔστασαν ἠὲ σίδηρος
ἀτρέμας ἐν βλεφάροισι: δόλω δ' ὅ γε δάκρυα κεῦθεν.

And Odysseus, having pity in his heart for his weeping wife,
but his eyes stood fixed as if of horn or iron
without motion in his eyelids,
and he concealed his tears with deceit. (Od.19.209-212)

He longs to be affective and is shown as having deep love for his wife, yet being the cunning hero, he knows he must restrain himself until, having fully reclaimed his household, he can engage in a true reunion with his beloved. This rationalization does not negate the emotion he feels, but instead serves to heighten the pathos that we feel for him,

so close to obtaining the primary connection of his heroism, and the motivation to complete his *nostos*, yet still unable to. Once he dispatches the suitors, reclaiming both household and identity, thus completing the *nostos*, he finally gets the reunion with his wife.

This reunion bears many resemblances to the reunion with Telemachus, his wife is initially suspicious of the man who she thinks is claiming to be her husband, and therefore she tests him by ordering their marriage bed to be set up outside their bedchamber (Od.23.176-80). This request prompts a long outburst from Odysseus, detailing why the movement of his marital bed should be impossible, as he himself carved it from a live olive tree at the center of their house (Od.23.181-205). The marital bed serves for Odysseus as a symbol both of his identity, and as representative of his entire household. Located in the bedchamber, it serves as focal point that showcases its privileged position in the house.²² Through his knowledge of the marriage bed Odysseus proves to his wife his true identity, finally reclaiming the marriage bond that is the center of the household. Through this reclaiming and final solidification of his identity to his primary connection, Odysseus is able to have a name that can be immortalized through *kleos*. As we have seen, one needed connections to serve as witnesses to their deeds, and by reclaiming his self-identity with his wife, Odysseus re-establishes himself as head of his household and *basileus* of Ithaca, establishing for himself his familial community that is the source of his *kleos*.

²² Zeitlin, 1995. pg. 119.

Once he has firmly established himself as Odysseus, we get an emotional reunion that is dominated by weeping and another Homeric simile. Neither of them needs to restrain themselves anymore and thus their emotions are on full display:

ὥς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑφ' ἴμερον ὄρσε γόοιο:
κλαῖε δ' ἔχων ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδνὰ ἰδυῖαν.
ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀσπάσιος γῆ νηχομένοισι φανήη,
ὣν τε Ποσειδάων εὐεργέα νῆ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
ράϊση, ἐπειγομένην ἀνέμῳ καὶ κύματι πηγῶ:
παῦροι δ' ἐξέφυγον πολιῆς ἀλὸς ἤπειρόνδε
νηρόμενοι, πολλὴ δὲ περὶ χροῖ τέτροφεν ἄλμη,
ἀσπάσιοι δ' ἐπέβαν γαίης, κακότητα φυγόντες:
ὥς ἄρα τῇ ἀσπαστὸς ἔην πόσις εἰσοροῶση,
δειρῆς δ' οὐ πω πάμπαν ἀφίετο πήγεε λευκῶ.

So he spoke, and it arose in him the longing to lament,
And he wept holding his delightful, true wife.
As welcome a sight as land to swimming men,
whose well wrought ships are broken by Poseidon on the sea,
being driven by wind and strong wave;
and few have fled from the gray sea to the mainland by swimming,
and thickly their skin is covered in brine,
and gladly they will go upon land having fled from misfortune.
So too at this time was her husband as welcome to her as she gazed upon him,
and altogether she could not release her white arms from his neck. (Od.23.231-240)

Both weep upon embracing, and Odysseus describes her as his delightful, true wife.

Indicating that there is a depth of connection present that was not there in the other female relationships he had during his travels. This is a woman that is irreplaceable and lays at the core of his heroic identity. Furthermore, the comparison between Penelope's feelings to the sailor who survives a shipwreck cast into sharp relief the trials that Odysseus has endured to get this familial moment. By comparing how Penelope feels with such a voyage the poet brings to mind the medium of the *nostos*, as well as how in the Odyssean world familial connections is the prioritized connection and these two

things are what allow the Odyssean hero to achieve eternal *kleos*. It is for this moment that Odysseus persisted, turned down immortality, and risked his life in battle against the suitors for.

A secondary reunion that serves to solidify the paradigm of Odyssean heroism is the reunion between Telemachus and Odysseus. This also happens to be the first-person Odysseus reveals his true identity to upon his return home. It is marked initially by Telemachus' disbelief and then tears as the absent father is finally able to embrace his son. However, this joyous moment is still marked by a hint of self-restraint on Odysseus' part, for when he reveals himself initially, he restrains the tears that arise:

τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:
'οὐ τίς τοι θεός εἰμι: τί μ' ἀθανάτοισιν εἴσκεις;
ἀλλὰ πατήρ τεός εἰμι, τοῦ εἵνεκα σὺ στεναχίζων
πάσχεις ἄλγεα πολλά, βίας ὑποδέγμενος ἀνδρῶν.'
ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας υἱὸν κύσε, καὶ δὲ παρειῶν
δάκρυον ἤκε χαμᾶζε: πάρος δ' ἔχε νωλεμῆς αἰεῖ.

But then the much-enduring divine Odysseus answered,
“But I am not some God, why do you compare me to the immortals?
But I am your father, on account of whom you have lamented
suffering many griefs, bearing the violence of men.”
So having said this he kissed his son,
and he let a tear pass falling to the ground
but as before he held them without pause. (Od.16.186-192)

The self-restraint of Odysseus has been characteristic throughout the entirety of his journey and it does not change even now that he has arrived home and he is revealing himself to his son. This reveals that although he has begun to complete his *nostos*, through a series of familial reunions, he still recalls what occurred when he lastly indulged in less restrained glory-seeking actions with the Cyclops. As this is the first

familial reunion and having not yet reclaimed his household, Odysseus has only completed part of his *nostos* so it is crucial that he remains restrained. However, just because his defining traits of cunning and self-restraint are still in play during this episode, this does not mean that the emotional weight of the moment is diminished. In fact, the poet uses an evocative Homeric simile when they embrace to demonstrate the love, loss, and emotional weight of the meeting:

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ
ἀμφιχυθείς πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ὀδύρετο, δάκρυα λείβων,
ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ὑφ' ἴμερος ὄρτο γόοιο:
κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, ἀδινώτερον ἢ τ' οἰωνοί,
φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες, οἷσί τε τέκνα
ἀγρόται ἐξεΐλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι:
ὥς ἄρα τοί γ' ἔλεεινὸν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δάκρυον εἶβον.

So saying he sat himself down, and Telemachus
embracing his noble father wept, tears pouring forth,
and a longing to weep arose in both men.
And lamenting shrilly, more vehemently than birds of prey,
sea-eagles, or vultures with crooked talons,
whose children the country men took from their nest
before they are able to fly: so piteously did tears fall from their brows. (Od.16.213-218)

The simile of the lamenting birds losing their young is a fitting one. Odysseus has been absent for the vast majority of his son's life due to his ten years fighting at Troy, followed by his ten-year journey home. The simile evokes the sound of the two men's lamentation. It provides depth of emotion and allows the reader (or audience) to appreciate the raw emotion present in this reunion. This reunion is also deeply important as it ensures the continuation of the male line for Odysseus' household, and it provides Odysseus with a secondary fighter for his upcoming battle with the suitors. Just as the Iliadic hero's *kleos* was dependant upon the warrior community, so too is the Odyssean hero's *kleos*

dependent on their familial community. The survival of and positive reunion with Telemachus ensures that Odysseus' *kleos* will continue to be spread upon his death, and that the crucial familial community will also be carried onwards. The reconnection with his son, is the first true familial connection that Odysseus acquires, and the deep emotion present highlights that these connections Odysseus as a hero is prioritizing, are indeed worthy of the suffering he has endured.

The last reunion is between Odysseus and his father Laertes. For the third time in the poem we see a reunion of family members. Odysseus finds his father physically separated from the household where he should belong, and this reunion serves as another episode that highlights the importance of familial connection for Odysseus. The physical separation of Laertes from the household is crucial as it is the poem emphasizing the disparateness of the household in Odysseus' absence. With the reunion and his completed *nostos* Odysseus is able to once again make his *oikos* whole, restoring his father to a position of privilege, rather than as someone who works the fields. Indeed, Odysseus once again weeps when he first sees his father in these circumstances:

τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
γῆραϊ τειρόμενον, μέγα δὲ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα,
στάς ἄρ' ὑπὸ βλωθρὴν ὄγχην κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβε.

And when enduring divine Odysseus saw him,
weakened with old age, having great grief in his heart,
he stood under a tall pear tree and he wept. (Od.24.232-234)

This, for the third time now, is an example where Odysseus is pained and moved to an emotive response for his family members suffering. Again, we see him grieve and weep.

He then decides to test his father with some cunning words, and this leads to the most drastic emotional response when Laertes begins to grieve for his lost son in the same manner that Achilles grieves for Patroclus in the *Iliad* (II.19.22-36):

ὣς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα:
ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν
χεύατο κακ κεφαλῆς πολιῆς, ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων.
τοῦ δ' ὠρίνετο θυμός, ἀνὰ ῥίνας δέ οἱ ἦδη
δριμὸν μένος προὔτυψε φίλον πατέρ' εἰσορόωντι.
κύσσε δέ μιν περιφύς ἐπιάλμενος, ἠδὲ προσηύδα:

So he spoke and a dark cloud of grief covered him:
And with both hands he seized the smoky dust
and poured it over his grey head with vehement groaning.
And his heart was stirred, and up through his nose rushed
a sharp force looking up at his dear father.
Springing towards him, he embraced and kissed him, saying thus: (Od.24.315-320)

The ritualistic grieving for the dead here is so evocative that Odysseus is no longer able to maintain his deception, but he returns simply to the foundational value of connection. This is the only one of the reunions where he feels physical pain at the display of grief, and he is so moved that his physical motion rather than a physical delay is noted. As with the other reunions the poet reminds us that these are the moments that are the completion of the *nostos*. We are able to feel the emotion as he is finally reconnected with the primary connections that define his actions. Overall, the three reunion scenes with his son, wife, and father, serve as the completion of Odysseus heroic journey. These emotional reunions, as well as the physical reclamation of his household are the last step of his *nostos*. The emphasis on the familial connections he regains one at a time, showcase how Odysseus is a hero driven by familial connection, and that his honour and shame are linked to his family and the medium of the *nostos*.

The final portion of Odysseus' *nostos*, concurrent with his emotional reunions, is his reclamation of the physical household and his property, including his slaves. This physical property and the household serves as a *geras* for Odysseus, with the household acting as an outward symbol of his honour. As a physical manifestation of his status as king of Ithaca, and a central piece of his *nostos*, Odysseus is concerned with the state of the household, as well as the slaves that are a part of it. Since the suitors have been dishonouring his household, they have been dishonouring him by extension. Therefore, the careful care for his physical house is representative of Odysseus caring for his honour. Upon his return to Ithaca he first meets the loyal swineherd Eumaeus, having been instructed to visit him in disguise by the goddess Athena. He engages in lengthy conversation with him to test his loyalties and as he receives the proper honour that should be shown a guest, including being fed and clothed, he is well pleased with the way Eumaeus has acted and looked after his property (Od.14.525-530). While this is a very slight reaction, it serves as the first instance where Odysseus will experience positive emotion in relation to his household. The connection that Odysseus has to his slaves is valuable to him, due to their role in maintaining his physical property. The maintenance of his household (as *geras*) makes the slaves valuable to him, and this is then the basis for his emotional reaction to them. Before Odysseus reveals himself to his son, we see yet again another instance where Odysseus reacts in an emotional way to the state of his household. Eumaeus and Telemachus are discussing the state of the household and the ruin that the suitors have left it in (Od.16.68-89) and although still in disguise Odysseus cannot help but react with anger:

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:
'ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ θὴν μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθαι θέμις ἐστίν,
ἧ μάλα μευ καταδάπτει ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ,
οἷά φατε μνηστῆρας ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάσθαι
ἐν μεγάροις, ἀέκητι σέθεν τοιούτου ἐόντος.

Then the much-enduring, divine Odysseus answered,
"O friend, since surely it is right for me to answer,
truly you rend my heart hearing these words,
such things you say the wicked suitors devised in your halls,
against your will, even with you being such as this." (Od.16.90-95)

Odysseus carefully hides his emotive response but he is not able to fully retrain himself.

He lashes out at the suitors, showing disgust and despair at the thought of his household being used in such a way. While he carefully phrases his disgust as a concerned friend with no personal ties, we must interpret this outburst as being representative of his own feelings. Even in disguise, Odysseus feels the dishonour that the suitors are bringing upon his *geras*. This care for his physical household, as well as the slaves that have maintained it in his absence, comes again to the forefront following the slaughter of the suitors.

Odysseus immediately cleanses his house and is then reunited with the female household slaves:

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς:
'πῦρ νῦν μοι πρῶτιστον ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γενέσθω.'
ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε φίλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια,
ἦναικεν δ' ἄρα πῦρ καὶ θήϊον: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
εὖ διεθείωσεν μέγαρον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν.
γρηῦς δ' αὖτ' ἀπέβη διὰ δώματα κάλ' Ὀδυσῆος
ἀγγελέουσα γυναιξὶ καὶ ὀτρυνέουσα νέεσθαι:
αἱ δ' ἴσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαι.
αἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἀμφεχέοντο καὶ ἠσπάζοντ' Ὀδυσῆα,
καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμεναι κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὄμους
χειράς τ' αἰνύμεναι: τὸν δὲ γλυκὺς ἴμερος ἦρει
κλαυθμοῦ καὶ στοναχῆς, γίγνωσκε δ' ἄρα φρεσὶ πάσας.

And then many wiled Odysseus answered,
“Firstly, let a fire be made in my hall.”
So he spoke and the dear nurse Eurycleia did not disobey,
and she brought fire and brimstone: and Odysseus then
thoroughly fumigated the hall, house, and court.
And then the old woman went back through the house
of noble Odysseus to bring a message to the women and urge them to come,
and they came from the hall holding torches in their hands.
They spread over and greeted Odysseus,
and they kissed his head and shoulder, and with strong affection
they took his hands. And a sweet longing seized him
to weep and to wail, for he knew them all well in his heart. (Od.22.490-501)

Odysseus shows the same care for the physical aspect of his home, that he rejoiced over earlier in Book 14. The careful fumigation following the slaughter indicates to us that it is a source of pride for him. Further as it is the outward, public facing aspect of his identity in the community, as it is the *geras* for his *nostos*, the care is required in order to present the proper heroic face to Ithaca, and this fumigation and cleansing is symbolic of his reintegration and reclaiming his household. Furthermore, the emotion he was unable to show Eumaeus due to the necessity of his disguise is now at the forefront of this reunion scene. Odysseus is overwhelmed at the reunion with a key part of his household. The emphasis on the known aspect of these people highlight the length of time that he has been away from them, as well as the foreign aspects which dominated his *nostos*. Having not been surrounded by anything familiar for such a long period of time Odysseus’ reunion with his property threatens to overwhelm him with emotion. This emotive reaction comes immediately after Odysseus orders the slaughter of his female slaves who slept with the suitors:

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς
'μή πω τήνδ' ἐπέγειρε: σὺ δ' ἐνθάδε εἰπέ γυναιξὶν
ἐλθέμεν, αἳ περ πρόσθεν ἀεικέα μηχανόωντο.'
ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ διέκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει
ἀγγελέουσα γυναιξὶ καὶ ὀτρυνέουσα νέεσθαι.
αὐτὰρ ὁ Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλον ἠδὲ συβώτην
εἰς ἔκαστον κάλεσάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:
'ἄρχετε νῦν νέκυας φορέειν καὶ ἄνωχθε γυναῖκας:
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα θρόνους περικαλλέας ἠδὲ τραπέζας
ὔδατι καὶ σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι καθαίρειν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ δὴ πάντα δόμον κατακοσμήσησθε,
δμῶς ἐξαγαγόντες εὖσταθέος μεγάροιο,
μεσσηγύς τε θόλου καὶ ἀμύμονος ἔρκεος αὐλῆς,
θινέμεναι ξίφεσιν τανυήκεσιν, εἰς ὃ κε πασέων
ψυχὰς ἐξαφέλησθε καὶ ἐκλελάθωντ' Ἀφροδίτης,
τὴν ἄρ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον μίσησθαι τε λάθρη.

And then many-minded Odysseus answered her:

“Do not wake her yet. But tell those women to come here,
who before contrived shameful things.”

So he spoke, and the old woman walked through the great hall,
bearing the message to the women, and telling them to come.

Meanwhile, Telemachus, the cowherd, and the goatherd,
having been summoned into the hall, he spoke winged words:

Begin now to bear the corpses, and command the women to aid you,
and thereafter, clean the beautiful chairs and tables
with water and porous sponges.

And when you have arranged the whole house,
lead the slave women away from the well-built hall,
to between the dome and the blameless fence of the court,
strike them with your tapered swords, until
you take away all their life, and they forget Aphrodite entirely,
which they had with the suitors, laying with them secretly. (Od. 22.430-445)

Odysseus displays a wide range of emotions and very differing reactions to his slaves

upon encountering them. He orders some to be put to death, yet the reunion with others

brings him to tears. This dichotomy of reactions is accounted for by the way Odysseus, as

the Odyssean hero, approaches his household and property. He chooses the connections

that are valuable to him and will bring him honour and severs the ones that will not. He

praises Eumaeus and is brought to tears by some of the slave women because they protected his honour and *geras*, not because he has a deep emotional connection to them as we see with his family. The casual slaughter of the slaves that Odysseus sees as detrimental to his identity as a hero and king of Ithaca reinforces the notion that a hero could and did choose and prioritize the connections that aid them. Therefore, in Odysseus' series of reunions with his slaves, we can see the impact that they have on his *geras*. The slaves are only valuable as connections due to their relation in the care of the household, and the household itself is the public facing *geras* of the Odyssean hero.

The final set of actions that cements Odysseus as a hero operating within the new Odyssean paradigm of heroism, instead of one that falls back into the paradigm of the Iliadic hero, is his removal of the battlefield and his martial prowess from the public sphere. Instead of broadcasting his deeds against the suitors, as one traditionally would do on the battlefield, Odysseus instead refuses to rejoice in his victory and does everything in his power to delay the news of his victory. Firstly, before the fight begins, he orders the doors of his home to be closed to the outside world by the swineherd and the cowherd (Od.21.225-242). This is his plan so that no one can escape once the fighting begins, however it serves the dual purpose of preventing the outside world from witnessing his martial prowess. This means that he is intentionally severing his link to the public domain (the open battlefield), where honour is used as the social currency and one is treated based on their status as a warrior.²³ Furthermore, as the fighting begins, he ensures this

²³ Van wees, 1992. pg. 69.

severing by entreating the nurse Eurycleia to guarantee that the gates are barred and that if the slaves in the house hear the noise they do not come and look (Od.21.380-392).

Again, he limits the amount of witnesses to his martial deeds and ensures that this slaughter remains a private matter of him reclaiming his household from those that dishonoured him. On the surface it may appear that he is engaging in the same medium of *kleos* that was so prevalent in the *Iliad*.²⁴ On closer inspection, Odysseus appears to be incorporating the medium of the battlefield, and the traits of the Iliadic hero into the medium of the *nostos* and the ideals of the Odyssean hero. We see him focused solely on the reclaiming of his home, prioritizing his connections to his family rather than a warrior community, and shaping his martial prowess to fit the medium of the *nostos*. These Odyssean ideals persist even following the battle and the clean-up of his household.

Odysseus orders the slave women to act as if a wedding is occurring:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς
‘τοιγὰρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω ὧς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα.
πρῶτα μὲν ἄρ λούσασθε καὶ ἀμφιέσασθε χιτῶνας,
δμῶα δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀνώγετε εἴμαθ' ἐλέσθαι:
αὐτὰρ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν
ἡμῖν ἠγείσθω φιλοπαίγμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο,
ὧς κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων,
ἢ ἂν' ὀδὸν στείχων, ἢ οἱ περιναιετάουσι:
μὴ πρόσθε κλέος εὐρὺ φόνου κατὰ ἄστυ γένηται
ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων, πρὶν γ' ἡμέας ἐλθέμεν ἔξω
ἀγρὸν ἐς ἡμέτερον πολυδένδρεον: ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα
φρασσόμεθ' ὅτι κε κέρδος Ὀλύμπιος ἐγγυαλίξει.

Then the many wiled Odysseus answered,
“Therefore, let me say what seems best to me.

²⁴ We may also say that Odysseus is reverting to the use of *bie* here which is a dominant attribute in Iliadic heroes such as Achilles and Ajax. However, raw *bie* is now what provides Odysseus with heroic success here, rather it is his combination of *metis* with *bie* that ensures his victory and reclamation of his home. For more on Odysseus as a polymetric hero see Williams, 2018.

First wash and then clothe yourself with a chiton
and command the female slaves in the hall to grasp their garments.
Then let the divine bard with clear toned lyre be our leader in the playful dance,
so that anyone hearing the sound outside,
either someone walking the road or the neighbours may say it's a wedding:
so that the glory of the slaughter of the suitors
will not go far from the town, before we go to our well wooded farm.
And there we shall devise whatever profit the Olympians give to us.” (Od.23.129-140)

This plan serves as a continuation of his determination to keep the public world as far removed from his deed for as long as he can. On a practical level it serves as a way to prevent retribution from relatives over the slaughter of the suitors. On the level of heroism though it is a continuation of his removal from the public sphere and the public medium of the battlefield, which was dependent upon the community of warriors. One is unable to have their martial prowess spoken of, and turned into honour, if there is no community of warriors to witness his prowess. Odysseus no longer prioritizes this form of heroism, and accumulation of honour. Instead, he prioritizes his familial connections, within the medium of the *nostos*. Therefore, although he is likely to gain *time* from these Iliadic actions, his priority is not the same as an Iliadic hero. Rather, he is concerned with the obtaining of honour through the reclamation of his household, which happens to require his martial prowess. Reclamation of household as the end of his *nostos* is the medium of glory here, not the open battlefield of the *Iliad*. Odysseus is shown therefore before and after the battle to be concerned with his familial relationships, and the security of his family and household.²⁵

²⁵ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 173.

We see this same focus on glory through the reclamation of his home immediately after the slaughter of the suitors. Whereas an Iliadic hero would be rejoicing in their martial accomplishments and reveling in the honour that they accrued for themselves, Odysseus never vaunts his glory and in fact curtails it in others.²⁶ The nurse Eurycleia upon seeing the slaughter revels in it, but is swiftly chastised:

ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσεὺς κατέρυκε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἰεμένην περ,
καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:
ἔν θυμῷ, γρηῦ, χαῖρε καὶ ἴσχεο μηδ' ὀλόλυξε:
οὐχ ὅσῃ κταμένοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάασθαι.
τούσδε δὲ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα:
οὐ τίνα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν, ὅτις σφέας εἰσαφίκοιτο:
τῷ καὶ ἀτασθαλίησιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐπέσπον.

But Odysseus held her back and checked her eagerness,
and speaking he addressed her with winged words:
“Rejoice in your soul, woman, but restrain yourself
and do not cry aloud. For it is not holy to glory over slain men.
The fate of the Gods has destroyed them,
and their own cruel deeds, for they honoured no man upon the earth,
neither evil nor good, whoever came among them,
by which wicked deed they turned themselves over to destiny. (Od.22.409-416)

Odysseus here makes the claim that one should not glory in the slaughter of their enemies. This is antithetical to the Iliadic heroic code that we explored earlier. Odysseus takes no glory in this deed because within the new Odyssean form of heroism, it is not the act of slaughter on the battlefield which brings him *kleos*, but the reunion that is the result of him freeing his household through means of slaughter. One should no longer glory

²⁶ Kundmueller, 2019. pg. 168-169.

over a slain enemy like a hero would do in the *Iliad* because the battlefield is no longer the medium upon which one obtains *time*.

Odysseus' actions and words surrounding the battle with the suitors all indicate the new form of heroism that he serves as the prime exemplar of. The battlefield, which served as the medium of the hero in the *Iliad* has been devalued. Instead, the Odyssean hero is concerned with the primary connections of family, going as far as to sever the links to the public sphere, in order to ensure familial safety and a successful *nostos*. This cutting off of everything other than the home makes it so that the hero is not obtaining *kleos* for deeds done on the battlefield, but instead through his reclaiming of and emotional reunion with his family. Overall, Odysseus undergoes an evolution in terms of heroism, with the paradigm evolving alongside him, through his physical *nostos* to his homeland. He starts out as the Iliadic hero, but as he reprioritizes his foundational connections, the medium of heroism and the traits of heroism shift. *Nostos* supersedes battlefield, and family dominates over the warrior community. The characteristic self-restraint, cunning and love of family that were learned behaviours during his long journey permeate every action of Odysseus by the end of the poem, representing how the Odyssean heroic paradigm has overcome the Iliadic paradigm over the course of the poem.

Conclusion

Homer's epic poems the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* present the reader with multiple versions of heroism that are continually evolving and challenging one another. The *Iliad* is centered around the idea that Achilles and Hektor both challenge the Iliadic heroic code of seeking *time* on the battlefield in order to receive an everlasting *kleos*. They take the motivators of shame and honour that drive heroes such as Ajax and complicate them with affective issues such as the loss of a friend or the desire to be familial. Odysseus shows how heroism changes between the world of the *Iliad* and the world of the *Odyssey*. The value of honor is deprioritized for the love of family as the driving force of heroism. As well, we see a shift from a public realm where a hero's deeds on the battlefield were widely broadcasted so that they could gain the reputation corresponding to their deeds, to the private realm where the heroes *kleos* is obtained through endurance and the emotional reunions that he experiences upon his successful return home. Through the examination of the evolution of Odysseus' character in the *Odyssey* we can track a parallel level of evolution of the concept of heroism, as embodied in the titular character.

Homeric heroism in all forms (Iliadic and Odyssean) is predicated upon connection. This foundational value is what we see heroes default to when the values of honour and shame no longer serve as sufficient motivators (as in Achilles), and without connection the much discussed honour/shame matrix of heroism would have nothing to operate upon. The heroes within Homer rely upon either a community of connections to bestow honour upon them, which is translated into *kleos* upon death, or in the case of Odyssean heroism they rely upon interpersonal, familial connections to achieve the same

thing. While the type of connection may vary hero to hero, nonetheless connection remains the constant across all Homeric heroism. Homer indeed seems to intentionally present what one may view as a singular heroic code, only to immediately complicate that view in another character. This flexibility of heroism is possible in large part due to the foundational value of connection's ability to be interpreted by the heroes in many ways, meaning they are able to prioritize different connections depending upon their unique scenario. Ajax, within the *Iliad* and the medium of war, prioritizes his connection to the warrior community, while Odysseus prioritizes both connection to the warrior community and his individual family members depending on what the medium dictates. Medium is crucial for the discussion of heroism, as heroes do not operate within a vacuum, and must recognize which medium they are in in order to behave in the proper heroic manner. Homer, through the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, plays heavily with the notions of medium, and how these mediums force different connections to be prioritized, forcing a change in heroism as well. The medium of war in the *Iliad* and the medium of the *nostos* in the *Odyssey* allow for a picture of heroism both in a time of war and a time of peace, and when read in tandem present to the audience a full view of heroism within Homeric society.

Scholarship in the past has focused on the values of honour and shame when investigating heroism, as we work to define a heroic code. Yet what I have often found missing is an argument for why the values of honour and shame are so effective for heroes within the Homeric society. I agree that these two values are of great importance and serve as a key component to both Homeric epics, but they often are discussed as if

they existed in a vacuum, and it seems taken for granted that these values are present. The notion that these values operate on top of the framework of connection provides the answer to that question of why honour and shame are so effective. Homeric society is built around honour and shame, but crucially, these values only carry weight when others validate them. Heroes require witnesses to their deeds. Heroes require an “other” to shame them. Without a witness, without any connections, a hero cannot gain *time* and by extension *kleos* as it is impossible to provide it to yourself. The combination of connections that a hero has provides the space for honour and shame to be important. If you remove the connections from Homeric society then you remove honour and shame as well.

Odysseus serves as the ideal hero to examine these concepts of heroism through. As one of the Greek *basileis* who fights at Troy in the *Iliad* and as the main character of the *Odyssey* he is a part of all forms of Homeric heroism at one point or another. His character is often reflective of the dominant paradigm of heroism, whether that be Iliadic heroism or Odyssean heroism, and he also serves to challenge these paradigms in many ways. The *Odyssey* especially relies on the characterization of Odysseus and the evolution of this across the poem to convey the evolution of heroism, from wartime to peace. Odysseus goes from the paradigm of the Iliadic hero in the *Iliad*, in the medium of war, to define the paradigm of the Odyssean hero, in the medium of the *nostos*, in a time of peace. The evolution of Odysseus and the evolution of heroism across Homeric epic is one and the same.

Throughout this thesis I have deliberately kept the idea of connection broad and open ended, choosing instead to focus on it as a collective concept rather than a more specific idea/word such as *xenia* or *philotes*. Going forward, it would be beneficial to conduct a more lexicographical approach to the concept of connection and its relation to heroism. In which one might look at every use of *xenia* and *philotes* to investigate their uses, and perhaps redefine *philotes* to mean connection. David Konstan has a study of this sort in *Friendship in the Classical World* (1997), but his is concerned with the ancient world in general, whereas this study would be limited to Homeric epic. On top of this lexicographical study, we would be able to ascertain the frequency with which these words are used by specific characters, informing us whether certain characters, such as Odysseus, are more closely tied to the concept of connection than others. The other added benefit to this would be the evidence either proving or disproving the idea that the broad conception of connection had a specific term within Homeric language. This would further prove the existence of a foundational value that was required for honour and shame to operate, as I have shown above. Further, framing Homeric heroism in terms of a foundational value of connection, rather than in terms of solely honour and shame raises a number of new questions about the nature of heroism. If the basis for heroism is connection, then are women capable of being quantified as heroes in the realm of Homeric epic? They appear to be able to form connections, and they appear to also be influenced by the notions of honour and shame.¹ Should we extend the conceptualization of heroism to these female individuals as well? As well, with the implementation of

¹ For more on women in Homeric epic see Cohen, 1995.

connection as the foundational value of heroism, how then does our conceptualization of combat change? The dialogue between allies, as well as the dialogue between foes, suddenly takes on a new colour in light of this foundational shift. Finally, the investigation into connection prompts the question of whether certain emotions in the Homeric world were more important than others. For example, we see Achilles' rage and grief at the forefront, but also pity. This raises the question of whether there is a core group of emotions that guides the defining value of connection, and whether certain emotions consistently produce meaningful connections in relation to heroism. We may be able to take the concept of connection and break it down into distinct emotional parts that have either beneficial or destructive qualities to a hero, and it would be fascinating to examine whether these vary hero to hero or if there was a consistency among Homeric heroic society.

My thesis has created space for this type of scholarship because I have shown that while the values of honour and shame are important, the foundational value of connection is the cornerstone of all Homeric heroism, giving it a multifaceted nature. Lacking this cornerstone of connection, the values of honor and shame would operate within a vacuum and not carry any significance. Further, I show that while connection and then the secondary honor/shame are consistent across all heroism, the medium within which the hero acts and interacts with these values is dynamic.

Due to the reprioritization of values that I argue for, it was necessary to begin by laying the framework for Homeric heroism before moving onto applying it to the *Iliad*. This approach allowed an in-depth view of how this framework of connection, and the

honour/shame matrix operated, and how Homer consistently complicates heroism through various characters. Ajax presented us with the reference point for an uncomplicated form of heroism before Achilles and Hektor then complicated Iliadic heroism in their own way. The medium of war was highlighted and I showcased how heroism is able to maintain the foundational value of connection while seeking *kleos*, even as individual heroes prioritized different connections.

One hero that consistently prioritized connection within the *Iliad*, and one who was set up as the Iliadic hero who excelled at the foundational heroic value, was Odysseus. Chapter 2, building upon the various forms of Iliadic heroism from Chapter 1, explored how Odysseus was again set apart from the uncomplicated Iliadic heroism set out with Ajax through his consistent attention to connection. This hyper awareness of connection meant that Odysseus in the *Iliad* was the hero concerned with the cohesion of the Greek army, as well being responsible for the repairing of broken bonds. Therefore, while part of the Iliadic heroic form, Odysseus is a hero of not only *metis*, but also a hero of connections.

Finally, we turn to the *Odyssey* where Homer presents the Odyssean form of heroism. The poem showcases how in tandem with Odysseus, heroism transitions from the Iliadic form, centered around the medium of war, to the Odyssean form, centered around the *nostos*. We continue to see the foundational value of connection within this new form of heroism, yet the connections that are prioritized evolve as well. Odysseus, shedding the crew he departed Troy with and therefore the Iliadic connections they represent, prioritizes his familial relationships that lay at the heart of the *nostos*. These

new connections and medium still allow Odysseus to be a hero that operates within the honour/shame matrix and accumulate *kleos*, but nonetheless operate in a different way than the Iliadic hero.

The three chapters to this thesis each examine a key piece of overall Homeric heroism and flow from the uncomplicated version of heroism present in Ajax to the completely redefined Odyssean heroism embodied in Odysseus. Homeric heroism is dynamic. Too often scholars provide a reductive view of heroism, focusing purely on honour/shame and a hero's physical prowess. Together the chapters of this thesis show that Homer viewed heroism as a fluid concept, one that was consistently evolving and being complicated. The differing characters classified as hero within these poems embodies this dynamic nature. The dynamism from basing the conceptualization of heroism around connection moves the question of what constitutes a hero from the stagnant debates surrounding how key values work in an imagined society, to a form of heroism where the key factor is deeply human. Heroism becomes something that does not belong to abstracted values, but instead something that is based in humanity, allowing honour and shame to have meaning within this society. Achilles' heroic journey in the *Iliad* ends not with his defeat of Hektor, but with his moment of connection to Priam, the father of his enemy. Odysseus' heroic journey, defining Odyssean heroism, rests solely upon his family connections. Lacking these our hero would have remained on Ogygia with Calypso and faded into anonymity. Instead, he completes his *nostos* earning the *kleos* of a hero in the process. *Kleos* needs connection to exist, and a hero needs connections to obtain *kleos*.

Bibliography

- Adkins, Arthur W.H. (1960) *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford University Press.
- Adkins, Arthur W.H. (1971) “Homeric Values and Homeric Society” in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 91, pp. 1–14. The Society for the Promotion of the Hellenic Studies. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/631365>
- Adkins, Arthur W.H. (1972) *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century*. Chatto & Windus Ltd. London. Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015004122183>
- Bakker, Egbert J. (1997) *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Cornell University Press. Accessed at: www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt207g69b
- Barker, Elton T.E. and Christensen, Joel P. (2006) “Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and Its Resonance with Homeric Epic” in *Materiali e Discussioni per L'analisi Dei Testi Classici*, no. 57, pp. 9–41. Fabrizio Serra Editore. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40236301>
- Bergren, Ann L.T. (1983) “Odyssean Temporality: Many (Re) Turns” in *Many Approaches to Homer* by Rubino, Carl A. and Shelmerdine, Cynthia W. (eds). University of Texas Press.
- Bolmarcich, Sarah. (2001) “ΟΜΟΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ in the ‘Odyssey’” in *Classical Philology* Vol.96 No.3, p.g. 205-213. The University of Chicago Press. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1215430>
- Burgess, Jonathan (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Cairns, Douglas (1993) *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.
- Christensen, Joel P. (2020) *The Many Minded Man: The Odyssey, Psychology, and the Therapy of Epic*. Cornell University Press.
- Clarke, Michael. (2004) “Manhood and Heroism” in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, p.g. 74-90. Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Beth. (1995) *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer’s Odyssey*. Oxford University Press.

- Cook, Erwin. (1999) “ ‘Active’ and ‘Passive’ Heroics in the ‘Odyssey’ ” in *The Classical World Vol. 93, No.2, Nov-Dec., pg. 149-167*. The Johns Hopkins University Press on behalf of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4352390>
- Edwards, Mark. (1987) *Homer: The Poet of the Iliad*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Farrell, Joseph. (2004) “Roman Homer” in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer, p.g. 254-271*. Cambridge University Press.
- Felson, Nancy and Slatkin, Laura M. (2004) “Gender and Homeric Epic” in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer, p.g. 91-116*. Cambridge University Press.
- Finkelberg, Margalit. (1995) Odysseus and the Genus “Hero” in *Greece and Rome Vol. 41 No. 1, p.g. 1-14*. Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/643068>
- Finley, Moses I. (1954) *The World of Odysseus*. Penguin Books.
- Foley, John M. (1999) *Homer’s Traditional Art*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fowler, Robert. (2004) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, Robert. (2004) “The Homeric Question” in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer, p.g.220-232*. Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich, Rainer. (2011) “Odysseus and Achilles in the ‘Iliad’: Hidden Hermeneutic Horror in Readings of the “Presbeia” in *Hermes, Vol.139, pg. 271-290*. Published by Franz Steiner Verlag. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23067316>
- Gill, Christopher. (1996) *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Graziosi, Barbara and Haubold, Johannes. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*. Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd.
- Haft, Adele J. (1990) “The ‘City-Sacker Odysseus’ in Iliad 2 and 10” in *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014), Vol. 120, pp. 37-56*. Published by The John Hopkins University Press. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/283977>
- Hainsworth, Bryan. (eds.) (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 3:Books 9-12*. Cambridge University Press. Accessed at: <https://doi-org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1017/CBO9780511518386>

- Herman, Gabriel. (1987) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heubeck, Alfred, West, Stephanie and Hainsworth, J.B. (eds.) (1998) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I, Introduction and Books i-viii*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Heubeck, Alfred and Hoekstra, Arie (eds.) (1989) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II, Books IX-XVI*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hinds, Stephen. (1998) *Intertext and Allusion: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Richard. (2004) "Homer and Greek Literature" in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. p.g. 235-253. Cambridge University Press.
- King, Katherine C. (1987) *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to The Middle Ages*. University of California Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (eds.) (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 1: Books 1-4*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (eds.) (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 2: Books 5-8*. Cambridge University Press. Accessed at: <https://doi-org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1017/CBO9780511620270>
- Knox, Bernard M.W. (1964) *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy*. University of California Press.
- Konstan, David. (1997) *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge University Press. Accessed at: <https://doi-org.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/10.1017/CBO9780511612152>
- Konstan, David. (2003) Translating Ancient Emotions in *Acta Classica, Vol. 46*, pg. 5-19. The Classical Association of South Africa. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24595340>
- Kundmueller, Michelle M. (2019) *Homer's Hero: Human Excellence in the Iliad and the Odyssey*. State University of New York Press.
- Martin, Richard P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Cornell University Press.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. (2007) *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*. Oxford University Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. (2005) "The Epic Hero" in *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, p.g. 71-89. John M. Foley (eds.). John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.

- Pache, Corinne Ondine. (2000) "War Games: Odysseus at Troy" in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 100, pg. 15-23. Harvard University. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3185206>
- Papaioannou, Sophia. (2007) *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad'*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
- Porter, James I. (2004) "Homer: The History of an Idea" in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, p.g. 324-343. Cambridge University Press.
- Redfield, James. (1994) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Duke University Press.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2001) "From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*" in *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* by Douglas L. Cairns (eds). Oxford University Press.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2001) "Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*" in *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* by Douglas L. Cairns (eds). Oxford University Press.
- Schein, Seth L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. University of California Press.
- Schein, Seth L. (1995) "Female Representations and Interpreting the *Odyssey*" in *The Distaff Side* by Beth Cohen. Oxford University Press.
- Schofield, Malcom. (2001) "*Euboulia* in the *Iliad*" in *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* by Douglas Cairns (eds.). Oxford University Press.
- Scodel, Ruth. (2008) *Epic Facework: Self-Presentation and Social Interaction in Homer*. The Classical Press of Wales.
- Segal, Charles. (1994) *Singers, Heroes and Gods in the Odyssey*. Cornell University Press.
- Sullivan, Shirley Darcus. (1988) *Psychological Activity in Homer: A Study of Phren*. Carleton University Press.
- Swift, Laura A. (2012) "Archilochus and the 'Anti-Hero'? Heroism, flight and values in Homer and the new Archilochus fragment (P.Oxy LXIX 4708)" in *JHS Vol.132*, pg. 139-55. The Society for Promotion of Hellenistic Studies. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41722259>
- Van Wees, Hans. (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam.
- West, M.L. (1999) "The Invention of Homer" in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 49 No.2, pp. 364-382. Published by the Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. Accessed at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/639863>
- Williams, Bernard. (1993) *Shame and Necessity*. University of California Press.

Williams, Hamish. (2018) “Polymetric Heroism in the Wanderings of Odysseus, Odyssey 9-12 (The Apologue)” in *Akroterion*, Vol. 63, pg. 1-20.

Zanker, Graham. (1994) *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad*. The University of Michigan Press.

Zeitlin, Froma I. (1995) “Figuring Fidelity in Homer’s Odyssey” in *The Distaff Side* by Beth Cohen. Oxford University Press.