

Experiencing Hektor

Character in the Iliad

Lynn Kozak

Experiencing Hektor

Also available from Bloomsbury

Homer's Iliad: A Commentary on Three Translations, Peter Jones

Homer: The Iliad, William Allan

Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad,
Irene De Jong

Experiencing Hektor
Character in the *Iliad*

Lynn Kozak

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo are
trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2017
Paperback edition first published 2018

Copyright © Lynn Kozak, 2017

Lynn Kozak has asserted her right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. xii constitute an
extension of this copyright page.

Cover image: *Death of Hektor*, oil on canvas 56 × 69 inches © Peter Bardazzi

This work is published open access subject to a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 licence (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0,
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may re-use, distribute,
and reproduce this work in any medium for non-commercial purposes, provided
you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher and provide a link
to the Creative Commons licence.

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for, any
third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this
book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher regret any
inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased to exist, but
can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kozak, Lynn, author.

Title: Experiencing Hektor : character in the Iliad / Lynn Kozak.

Description: London ; New York : Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. |

Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016027329 (print) | LCCN 2016028121 (ebook) |

ISBN 9781474245449 (hardback) | ISBN 9781474245463 (epdf) |

ISBN 9781474245456 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Hector (Legendary character) in literature. | Homer. Iliad.

Classification: LCC PA4037 .K665 2016 (print) | LCC PA4037 (ebook) |

DDC 883/.01--dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016027329>

ISBN: HB: 978-1-4742-4544-9

PB: 978-1-3500-7401-9

ePDF: 978-1-4742-4546-3

ePub: 978-1-4742-4545-6

Typeset by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk

To find out more about our authors and books visit
www.bloomsbury.com and sign up for our newsletters.

For my parents, who have given me everything.

Contents

Acknowledgements	xii
Preface	xv
Introduction: Binge-watching the <i>Iliad</i>	1
Previously on... The <i>Iliad</i>	3
Beats	6
Episodes	10
Arcs	13
Character change	15
Character overhaul	17
Character transformation (Stockholm syndrome?)	18
Experiencing Hektor	20
1 Enter Hektor	23
<i>In media res</i>	23
Diegetic introduction: 1.233–350	25
Thetis: 1.351–611	26
Achaians assemble: 2.1–394	28
Hektor on the horizon: 2.394–473	28
Catalogue: 2.474–785	29
Reveal: 2.786–810	30
Trojan catalogue: 2.811–3.14	31
Enter Paris: 3.15–37	32
Hektor and Paris: 3.38–75	33
Setting terms: 3.76–120	35
Troy-time: 3.121–260	36
Trusted oaths (untrustworthy sons): 3.261–302	38
Duel: 3.303–448	38
Missing in action: 3.448–61	39
Gods: 4.1–72	40
Broken oaths: 4.73–222	41
Ready to rumble: 4.220–421	42

Battle: 4.422–543	44
Overhaul: 5.1–453	45
Returns: 5.454–532	47
Battle: 5.533–89	49
Overhaul: 5.590–627	49
Sarpedon: 5.628–78	50
Hektor: 5.679–710	51
Silent type: 5.711–909	52
Achaians kill: 6.1–36	54
Even the unborn: 6.37–72	55
Mission: 6.73–118	56
Face-off: 6.119–236	58
Troy-time: 6.237–85	58
Mission continued (Hekabe): 6.242–85	59
Mission impossible: 6.286–311	60
Mission (Paris and Helen): 6.312–68	61
Mission (Andromache): 6.369–502	63
2 Killing Time	69
Maybe next time: 6.503–7.16	70
Callback: 7.17–91	72
Achaians: 7.92–213	73
Fight/Night: 7.214–312	75
Wall alignment: 7.313–44	78
Troy-time: 7.345–80	79
Death all round: 7.381–8.51	79
Battle: 8.52–197	81
Hera/Zeus: 8.198–252	84
Battle: 8.253–334	85
Overhaul-ish: 8.335–437	86
Hera/Zeus: 8.438–84	88
Die another day: 8.485–9.88	89
Embassy: 9.89–713	90
Spy vs Spy: 10.1–579	92
All day permanent red: 11.1–162	97
Hektor rising: 11.163–368	99
Injuries: 11.369–488	102
Hektor returns: 11.489–594	103

Mission, Achilles: 11.595–848	104
Wall alignment: 12.1–39	106
Hektor, whirlwind: 12.40–83	107
Mission crew: 12.84–109	108
Wall fight!: 12.110–194	109
Hektor/Wall: 12.195–289	110
Wall fight!: 12.290–12.431	112
Hektor/Wall: 12.432–71	113
Zeus/Poseidon: 13.1–82	114
Mission crew: 13.83–129	116
Hektor again: 13.130–205	117
Idomeneus/Meriones: 13.206–333	118
Zeus/Poseidon: 13.334–60	120
Idomeneus/Meriones: 13.361–580	120
Menelaos: 13.581–673	123
Hektor/Panic: 13.674–837	124
Achaians assemble (injury edition): 14.1–152	128
Hera: 14.153–360	130
Hektor/Aias: 14.361–439	131
Battle: 14.440–507	133
When Zeus wakes: 14.508–15.86	133
Other gods: 15.87–149	135
Apollo/Hektor: 15.150–270	136
Battle again: 15.271–389	137
Patroklos: 15.390–405	138
Hektor/Aias: 15.406–591	139
Overhaul: 15.592–746	142
Stuck in the middle with you	144
3 Ends	147
Achilles/Patroklos: 16.1–100	148
Hektor: 16.101–23	149
Achilles/Patroklos: 16.124–256	150
Battle: 16.257–357	151
Aias/Hektor: 16.358–418	153
Sarpedon: 16.419–507	154
Mission/Hektor: 16.508–53	155
Patroklos/Counter-mission: 16.554–683	157

Patroklos/Hektor: 16.684–867	159
Bad news travels slow (Menelaos): 17.1–112	162
Aias/Hektor: 17.113–39	164
Glaukos/Hektor: 17.140–82	165
Death suits you: 17.183–209	166
Overhaul-ish: 17.210–236	167
Aias/Menelaos: 17.237–61	168
Battle: 17.262–369	168
Bad news travels slow: 17.370–411	170
Horses: 17.412–542	171
Patroklos: 17.543–625	172
Bad news travels slow: 17.626–18.21	174
Black cloud of grief: 18.22–146	177
Saving Patroklos: 18.147–238	178
Hektor: 18.239–314	179
Black cloud of grief: 18.314–55	180
Gods: 18.356–616	181
Make up: 19.1–281	183
Black cloud of grief: 19.282–356	184
Armour and horses: 19.357–503	185
Battle (Achilles)	186
Gods take sides: 20.1–75	187
Achilles/Aineias: 20.75–352	188
Hektor/Achilles: 20.353–454	190
Kill, kill, kill: 20.455–21.33	192
Sleeping with the fishes: 21.34–210	193
When rivers attack: 21.211–382	194
God-fight: 21.383–525	196
Defender of Troy: 21.526–22.6	197
Achilles: 22.7–24	198
Cheap seats: 22.25–89	198
Hektor: 22.90–130	200
The great escape: 22.131–66	201
Gods: 22.166–247	202
Hektor versus Achilles: 22.247–369	203
Bodies: 22.369–404	206
Bad news travels fast: 22.405–36	207
Bad new travels slow: 22.437–515	208

Achaians: 23.1–257	210
Games: 23.257–897	212
Misery never sleeps: 24.1–22	215
Missions from gods: 24.23–188	216
Priam and Hekabe: 24.189–227	219
Curtains for curses: 24.228–321	221
Hermes: 24.322–467	222
Supplication: 24.468–571	223
Promises, promises: 24.572–95	224
Eat, drink, plan a funeral: 24.596–676	225
Midnight run: 24.677–91	225
Troy-time: 24.691–722	226
Eulogies: 24.723–76	227
Funeral: 24.777–804	228
Conclusion: Reruns	231
Notes	235
Works Cited	281
Index	299

Acknowledgements

This book owes much to many, and at the risk of sounding like the *Iliad*'s narrator at 2.488–93, I'll try the best I can to thank them all here, and I'll try to limit the number of times I say 'awesome'.

I want to first thank Bruce King, my first and best teacher of Homer. Many thanks also to Seth Schein, for many wonderful conversations about Homer over the years, and for always encouraging me to write my book on Hektor. I'd also like to thank Chris Love, for great discussions years ago in Evanston about *The Wire*, where my arguments for serial television as epic began.

I owe a thousand thanks to the always awesome Alan Sommerstein, who, with much patience and generosity, oversaw my doctoral thesis in Nottingham on Hektor, and who graciously supported my revisiting Hektor when I told him about this project.

I was lucky enough to see two long-duration shows this past year that greatly influenced my thinking about live serial narrative and gave me the greatest pleasure: many thanks to the Hypocrites' production of Sean Graney's *All Our Tragic* in Chicago and to the National Theatre of Wales' production of Christopher Logue's *Iliad*, directed by Mike Pearson and Mike Brookes, in Llanelli.

I am especially indebted to the artists whom I talked to about the *Iliad*, for their insights, for their talents, and for their amazing *Iliads*, which moved me and always made me think about the text in new ways: Denis O'Hare, Stathis Livathinos, Pete Smith, Dean Fleming, Micheline Chevri er, Daniel Lillford, Sean Graney. I want to thank Paul Van Dyck most of all, who taught me more than I can say through many conversations, his strong dramaturgy, and his awesome performances in *Iliad* 21/22.

I want to thank Jen Quinn and Jo Joffre and all the awesome peeps at the Freestanding Room, for letting me do *My Favourite Deaths* in the 2016 Shortstanding Festival. Thanks to all the great artists and audience members who supported the project, and let me perform a bit of the *Iliad* for you.

I want to thank Hans Beck and Mike Fronda for pushing me back to Homer: it has been a hard road, but one that I am so glad to have travelled.

Many thanks for the writing support of my amazing manuscript group at McGill and the wonderful historians who read my work and contributed so

much to my ideas and to my confidence: Elizabeth Elbourne, Jess Clark, Marie-Louise Ermisch, Rachel Sandwell and Laila Parsons. My fellows' cohort at the McGill Institute of the Public Life of Arts and Ideas also deserve a hearty thank you for their feedback, and their amazing company over our two years together: Garth Green, Bronwen Low, Monica Popescu, Jui Ramprasad and director Paul Yachnin. I want to thank IPLAI generally for giving me a writing space in the Winter Term of 2015, and to Sheetal Lodhia for being so cool and supportive. Thanks also to my fellow writing-space team for keeping me honest: V.K. Preston, Katie Zien, Aparna Nadig and Meredith Warren.

I want to thank Nancy Worman for an amazing conversation about the *Iliad* on the Nottingham downs, and for coming to my *Iliad* 21/22 performance in New York – thanks also to Iakovos Vasiliou, Helene Foley and Laura Slatkin for coming and for your great feedback and encouragement.

Thanks to Anne-France Morand, Pascale Fleury and Alban Baudou for inviting me to Université Laval for a talk on Hektor, and to all my colleagues and the students who came to that talk: Martin Voyer's comments were particularly helpful.

I want to thank Walter Koh, my sometimes MA student, for many great conversations about Homer, and whose excellent work on apostrophe has changed my mind about many things.

Thanks to Jason Mittell, who was fortuitously in Montreal in October 2015 for a talk at Concordia University, who answered many of my questions about serial narrative in television and posed many more: it was great getting to hang out.

I was lucky enough to teach the *Iliad* in my Winter 2016 Intermediate Greek class, and my students have been wonderful in allowing me to work out some of this book's ideas as I was revising this manuscript. Many thanks to Ezzekiel Amores, Donald McCarthy, George Popi, Dominic Langlois Provencher, Molly Rosenzweig, Yi Yang Teoh and Lily Zhu, for great class discussions and a lot of fun.

Other students contributed to this book as assistants: I want to thank Daniel Whittle who tracked down some bibliography, Meghan Poplacean who helped with notes, and Courtney Ewan who helped with the bibliography.

Many thanks to Alice Wright and Lucy Carroll and everyone at Bloomsbury, for their infinite patience and help, as well as to my anonymous reviewers, who have contributed so much to this process. One reviewer, in particular, was amazing with bibliographical suggestions and keen insights – if I ever meet you, I'd like to buy you a beer and have a chat about Homer.

I must thank the many of my colleagues who have been amazing during this time, including Miranda Hickman, Erin Hurley, Michael Jemtrud, Pierre Bonnechere, Sean Gurd, Michelle Cho, Alanna Thain, Myrna Wyatt Selkirk and all my wonderful colleagues in the McGill Department of History and Classical Studies: I'm truly blessed to be in such a supportive department.

In the day-to-day of writing, Tara, Steve, Poulami, Amanda, Jonathan, Dawn, Conny, Nadia, Sami, and the whole Quesada crew are always a bright spot in many long days, keeping me going with great burritos and good company. John and Darren in Leacock saved me from many a stressful situation, from late night intruders to wayward sparrows. Lorenz Lüthi emerged as a true friend, a constant source of encouragement and snacks. Gavin Walker kept putting a positive spin on this whole 'write a book' thing, and it helped, a lot. Thanks also to Daviken Studnicki-Gizbert, Catherine Le Grand, and Peter Hoffmann for often checking in.

This book-writing process put a real strain on myself and my mental health, so I'd like to thank some of the people who personally supported me through it this past year. David Meren, best best friend a girl could ask for. Shanon Fitzpatrick, who arrived at McGill and saved my life (Tim Merlis is pretty cool too). Sophia Panaretou, for an amazing adventure to Wales. Joel Ward for long-distance encouragement and football banter. Lisa Trentin for being so awesome – so glad we ended up in the same country. Michael Silk for our semi-annual London dinner chats. Dan Lee for a much-needed break from the work to be myself again. Tom Jundt for just getting me. Alyssa Coiley for being my oldest friend, and so damn cool. James Valadez, for Chicago, for disco house, for sharing good food and good culture. Carina de Klerk for being my BFF, my family, my Oimoi co-AD, and for last minute reading a whole lot of this here book. My whole extended family that makes me feel so lucky all the time. My brother Stephen for being my best man, permanently: I'm so proud to know you and all the light you bring. My parents, Steve and Janet, for everything – my dad's curiosity and creativity are endless, my mom's intelligence, intuition and eloquence are legend. More than anything, you guys taught me to have fun no matter what (like the great Milt Trenier says, 'there's fun to be had if you let yourself have it'), which I tried to remember in writing this book: schooners at Liuzza's soon. Finally, my greatest thanks are for my husband, Joseph Shragge – so talented, so smart, so handsome, so hilarious – for listening to me crying on the phone late at night in the office, for keeping me stocked in tostada supplies, for long mountain walks, for poetry, for comedy, for theatre, for binge-watching television. I am so lucky to be sharing this life with you, because you make every day better.

Preface

I started this project stuck on Hektor's death. I couldn't get over why it hung with me so much, why I felt like I was always mourning Hektor. So this book began as a line-by-line reading of Hektor's character, within the context of serial poetics, as an attempt to understand why Hektor's death hit me so hard. But the more that I considered the way that serial narratives work, the more I became interested *again* in the *Iliad* as a whole, with its multiplicity of characters, and the great pleasure that the epic in its epic-ness provides. So I moved away from philological analysis and moved instead towards a beat-by-beat analysis of the *Iliad*, with a special focus on how those small narrative units built audience allegiance with Hektor. I hope that this book will be accessible to undergraduates, but of some interest to scholars as well. My primary goal is to expand the idea of Homeric poetics beyond oral poetry, to think instead about the demands and pleasures of serial narrative, a form that most of us still enjoy today.

While many scholars have noted the *Iliad's* cinematic qualities, most scholars have focused on the novel as a comparative form in considering its narrative properties. But a novel does not place the same demands on its audience, nor does it enlist the same strategies as non-literate, serial forms do in terms of audience memory and engagement. While serial television varies greatly from epic performance, my hope is that in focusing on the similar narrative strategies of the two forms, I might open the text up a bit, particularly for students. I love the *Iliad*, and if there's ever anything that I can do to bring the *Iliad* to anyone else, or to let anyone see the *Iliad* in a new way, than that's all I can ever hope for.

The text for the *Iliad* that I have used throughout (except where otherwise noted) is that available on the Chicago Homer (<http://homer.library.northwestern.edu/>):

Homer: Iliad Books 1–12, edited by D. B. Monro, Third Edition, Oxford University Press, 1902.

Homer: Iliad Books 13–24, edited by D. B. Monro, Third Edition, Oxford University Press, 1902.

All translations are my own.

Introduction: Binge-watching the *Iliad*

One of the things that I like about the show myself, and it might be the same as the crowd who watches it, is that it is not trying to be fast. It's not trying to be flashy. It takes its time and it's all leading to one specific thing and it's about these people's relationships . . . And there are so many details and it's so elaborate, what's happening, and you have to wait a long, long time sometimes to get the payoff of something that's been planted like a little seed in the corner. And I think that that appeals to certain people. And for that reason they become addicted in a different way, that they are not getting the dish served and they eat it and they forget about it, but that it's something that is served, but not fully, that it will be served a little more next time, and I think that appeals to these fans.

Mads Mikkelsen, on *Hannibal* (NBC, 2013–15)¹

I am addicted to stories. And the story that I am addicted to the most is the *Iliad*: I read it or listen to it or watch it performed or perform it over and over and over again, and I weep (usually for Hektor), and still I can't wait to experience it again. When I work, mostly on the *Iliad*, I watch television. Hours and hours of television. Strangely, but not so strangely, these two addictions developed at around the same time in my life, when I found myself shifting my devotion from Greek tragedy to epic and slipping from 'film buff' to 'TV addict'. This book explores these addictions through the shared poetics of the *Iliad* and contemporary television, and how serial narrative uses characterization to 'hook' its audiences, just as the *Iliad* has caught me with its Hektor.

The *Iliad* stands as a coherent piece of oral (or orally-derived) poetry with a narrative structure that shows it to be a product of aesthetic intent,² whether it was created by many voices or by a single composer/poet,³ whether over a long period of time or in a single period of composition.⁴ Performers deliver (or would have delivered) the *Iliad* both episodically and sequentially, as a *serial* narrative.⁵ Episodes within this serial performance contain important narrative events like the death of Patroklos, the death of Hektor or the ransom of Hektor's

body: the order of these scenes matters as much as what they contain. An audience might consider each of these scenes as distinct and disparate from one another, but they cohere into a single long narrative, with a beginning (the rage of Achilles), a middle (battles and battles) and an end (the funeral of Hektor). The *Iliad* is long-form serial performance that we can consume, but not all at once (every performer, every audience member, must take breaks from the *Iliad*).

Serial narratives rely on certain poetics in part because of their length, which places huge demands on an audience's memory (in addition to the memory of an oral poet/performer).⁶ This length consists of both actual narration time as well as breaks between sections of narrative, or 'episodes'.⁷ So before exploring the *Iliad* within the poetics of serial narratives, it is helpful to understand the *Iliad* as a serial narrative, as a temporal experience that consists of both episodes and breaks. The extant *Iliad* encompasses nearly sixteen thousand lines, which a performer would have delivered in sequence over several days with many performance breaks. While it is impossible to know the exact length of any given performance of the *Iliad*, it is nonetheless worthwhile to consider approximate performance times, because they can help place narrative events in relative position to each other within an experience of the *Iliad*'s story. For calculating the amount of time that passes in performance, I use a metric from my own production of *Iliad* 21/22, where the performer, Paul Van Dyck, averaged around thirteen and a half lines per minute in his performance of my English translation of those books, which would produce a total performance time of between nineteen and twenty hours for the whole epic. While using an English translation may seem like an odd choice, this average at least accounts for fluency and movement as part of a performance time.⁸ More, it comes into a comfortable middle ground between the fifteen hours that it took for the 2015 Almeida Theatre presentation of reading the *Iliad* in English,⁹ and the possibly slower times that the Greek requires. In Greek, Katherine Kretler's performance pace comes to between ten and thirteen lines per minute.¹⁰ Stephen Daitz's work with Homer in pitch accent averages out to around nine lines per minute,¹¹ or around thirty hours of performance time. Taplin estimates around twenty-five hours total performance time.¹² These different estimates show the impossibility of capturing a 'real' performance time, so I will use my average simply to give an idea of the total performance time and to create a constant against which relative points in the narrative can be compared.

In addition to the total performance time, we must also take into account that performers would have to take breaks. Most scholars divide the *Iliad* into three separate performance sessions, lasting six to ten hours each.¹³ This might be

possible in terms of *total* performance, but breaks would most certainly have to be taken more often than every six to ten hours, given the physical demands on both the performer and the audience.¹⁴ Ancient evidence points to shorter parts of the *Iliad* being performed: these might suggest ‘episodes’ from performances of the whole.¹⁵ Observational studies of ‘analogous’ singer traditions put breaks at every half hour or so,¹⁶ or whenever the singer might get tired.¹⁷ Having worked with performers, and having sat through several longer shows, I would say that performance chunks could reasonably be between a half hour and an hour and a half, with total performance time coming to twelve hours a day *including* regular, and sometimes longer, breaks.¹⁸ While these thoughts on time are purely speculative, they provide a working framework within which to consider the *Iliad* as a serial narrative.

Previously on . . . The *Iliad*

While the length of the *Iliad* alone implies a complex narrative, that complexity manifests itself in multiple features of the epic across its storyworld, characters, events, settings and temporalities.¹⁹ What Mittell says of television serial can be said of ancient epic: the serial ‘creates a sustained narrative world populated by a consistent set of characters who experience a chain of events over time.’²⁰ This can be applied to many storytelling forms, but serial narratives are unique in that they balance the episodic and the continuous in such a way that maintains audience engagement over great lengths of time and multiple breaks from the narrative.

Serial narrative as a form has historically emerged through a range of media, from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century serialized novels,²¹ to radio serials, to comic books, to contemporary television. Television has seen ebbs and flows in its commitment to seriality, and scholars draw a distinction between *serials* and *series*: series are designed to run indefinitely, and might include shows like *ER* (NBC, 1994–2009), *NYPD Blue* (ABC, 1993–2005), or soap operas like *Coronation Street* (ITV, 1960–). A serial, on the other hand, is ‘usually fixed to a limited number of episodes with a clearly defined beginning, middle, and end’, and so, in many ways is ‘an expansion on the creative coherence of the single play.’²² Shows within this genre include *Breaking Bad* (AMC, 2008–13), *Sons of Anarchy* (FX, 2008–14) and *Game of Thrones* (HBO, 2011–present), but perhaps even more particularly, anthology shows like *American Horror Story* (FX, 2011–) or *True Detective* (HBO, 2014–): these serials have a clear ‘end point’ that they

aim for, either from its beginning, or from a mid-point within the narrative.²³ Sometimes, just as with the *Iliad*,²⁴ certain events, characters, and even the serial's end are based on 'traditional' source materials,²⁵ ranging from novels to comic books to other television shows and films: consider *Hannibal* (NBC, 2013–15), *Game of Thrones* (HBO, 2011–), *Gotham* (FOX, 2014–) or *Sherlock* (BBC, 2010–). Shows can also determine and reveal their own end-points, which the narrative then works towards, like *How I Met Your Mother* (CBS, 2005–14). The contemporary television serial as a long-form closed narrative is now nearly ubiquitous, driven in part by technological advances that allow viewers to 'binge-watch' entire seasons or shows at a time, feeding their addictions.²⁶

Of course, the experience of watching a single performer of the *Iliad* over several days differs drastically from the experience of watching a television serial over several days (or weeks, months, or even years). Temporally, we might stretch our analogy to think of the epic cycle as a mirror for serial anthology programmes, where each 'season' correlates to an epic poem in the cycle. But still television undeniably differs from epic performance. Television works as a visual and aural medium that uses multiple physical locations and embodied actors to tell stories usually written by several authors within a format that is (usually) temporally and commercially constrained (i.e. each episode can be forty-two minutes long, with a budget of one million dollars), though there are, as I will show, exceptions to this production mode. Nevertheless, both ancient epic and contemporary television serials (or radio serials) are non-literate narrative forms that both work harder to construct and are more reliant on audience memory than literary serial narratives like novels or comic books. So contemporary television serial poetics can provide a helpful analogue to those of the ancient epic.²⁷

Poetics, more than other literary theories,²⁸ consider the text alongside its producers' strategies and its audience outcomes. Poetics can be historical,²⁹ but I will use them to examine the analogous structures and strategies that allow for sustained audience engagement in serial narratives. Michael Z. Newman's article on the poetics of serial television, 'From Beats to Arcs: Toward a Poetics of Television Narrative', discusses television serials as having three distinct levels – beats, episodes, and arcs (to which I would add 'sequences' between beats and episodes) – within its long-form structure that I will show can also be seen in the *Iliad*.³⁰

At each level, I will also address character, and how narrative strategies and audience response combine to construct characters within serial narratives. Character exists as a constructed analogue to a person,³¹ or a fictional being,³² rather than a sign, symbol, or even a type.³³ This fictional being emerges through

‘all information associated with a character in a text’³⁴ (whether directly or indirectly associated) and audience engagement with that information: the narrative strategically provides a constellation of character information that we as the audience connect into a whole. The term ‘identification’ has often defined this kind of relationship between audience and character, but Murray Smith’s model of film character engagement feels more experientially accurate,³⁵ as it describes the audience’s recognition, alignment, and allegiance with characters.³⁶

Recognition ‘describes the spectator’s construction of character: the perception of a set of textual elements . . . as an individuated and continuous human agent.’³⁷ Narratives promote audience recognition of character by providing a character’s physical cues along with their names, roles, and relationships, all of which the audience can latch onto. At the same time, the amount of time and information that a narrative gives a character allows the audience to recognize how central that character is within the story.

Once a narrative has established character recognition in its audience, it can begin to build what Smith calls ‘character alignment.’³⁸ As Smith says, ‘Structures of alignment are produced by two, interlocking character functions, cognate with narrational range and depth: *spatio-temporal attachment* and *subjective access*.’³⁹ Mittell sums up these two aspects of alignment: ‘Alignment consists of two key elements: *attachment*, in which we follow the experiences of particular characters, and *access* to subjective interior states of emotions, thought processes, and morality.’⁴⁰ Both epic and television serials give their audiences many opportunities to attach to characters, showing us what characters do or say. Access is trickier. Scholars have often lamented over a perceived lack of interiority in the *Iliad*’s characters,⁴¹ but television, too, rarely gives direct, interior access to its characters. With the exception of shows that feature first-person voice-over, like *Dexter* (Showtime 2006–13), *Peep Show*, (Channel 4, 2003–) or *Mr. Robot* (USA, 2015–), the majority of contemporary television programmes give little interior access to their characters. Likewise, the *Iliad* occasionally gives us access to a character ‘talking to their own heart’, in a kind of externalized form of inner monologue.⁴² But for the most part, both television serials and the *Iliad* allow audiences to infer their characters’ interior states through ‘an accumulation of external markers,’⁴³ like character appearance,⁴⁴ gesture, dialogue,⁴⁵ and explicit narrative. Audiences then use these markers to guess as to what a character’s motivation might be,⁴⁶ which aids in alignment. Once an audience aligns with a character, they are open to character allegiance, which means that the audience morally judges them, and will feel either sympathy or antipathy with them in part based on those judgements.⁴⁷ So Smith’s model, which Mittell adapts for

television character, clearly describes audience experience of character over time: we come to recognize a character (recognition), then we spend time with that character and get to know that character (alignment), and finally, we come to like or dislike that character (allegiance).

Most serial narratives rely on broad ensembles of characters. This means that serials frequently shift audience alignments, allowing the audience to attach to one character or another, so that audiences often have multiple allegiances and almost always know more than any one character knows,⁴⁸ in what Smith terms a 'melodramatic structure of alignment'.⁴⁹ When the audience knows more than any individual character does,⁵⁰ they will then guess at and watch for character reactions to those events as much as for further narrative progression.⁵¹ Most contemporary television serials rely on this dynamic, and scholars now recognize that shows like *The Wire* (HBO, 2002–8) and *Lost* utilize melodramatic alignment structures to great effect.⁵² Smith equates melodrama with the 'expressive tradition',⁵³ sidestepping its gendered connotations with a focus on character expressivity. 'Performance expressivity endows the narration with great depth, which, in combination with a pattern of multiple attachment, produces the distinctive alignment pattern that we have termed the melodramatic structure of alignment.'⁵⁴ Complex serial narratives like ancient epic and contemporary television serials use characters, their emotional responses to events, and our emotional responses to those characters, as the basis for their narrative structures. Now I will return to those narrative structural levels to demonstrate how these fundamentals of character construction work from beats, to episodes, and finally, to arcs, with some consideration of sequences.

Beats

The smallest structural unit of serial television that Newman identifies is the 'beat',⁵⁵ which can sometimes (but not always) be the same as a 'scene'. In a beat, something happens; a scene (in television) usually implies a switch of location.⁵⁶ Alex Epstein gives the example of a car chase, which is a single action or plot point (beat), but can take place across multiple scenes; likewise a party at a beach (or, for the *Iliad*, a battle), might contain several beats, where diverse events or conversations take place in the same scene.⁵⁷

The *Iliad*, like a television serial, consists of a long series of often very short beats.⁵⁸ In television, beats are usually less than two minutes long,⁵⁹ and so move the action along at a fast clip:⁶⁰ exceptions are often deliberate, and can either

mark a particular scene (or rarely, of a whole show) as unconventional. *Daredevil*'s second season introduces popular comic book character The Punisher/Frank Castle as a main antagonist for Daredevil/Matt Murdock (Netflix, 2015–). His character's import (and the possibility of a future spin-off show) both mean that his first dialogue scene with Daredevil comes in at almost a full six minutes,⁶¹ two to three times longer than the other beats in the episode. This length allows the episode to set up the primary conflict between the two characters that will drive their story arcs in the coming episodes. We can see something similar in the *Iliad*, in the beat that establishes the conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles, which, in their first exchange, would last nearly seven minutes of performance time (1.101–87). But most beats are much shorter. The previous beats in Book 1 last from less than a minute (the proem, 1.1–7), to about two and a half minutes (the exchange between Kalchas and Achilles, 1.69–100).⁶²

Beats generally focus on either characters or events, but the two always work in tandem: events involve characters, while characters also discuss or respond to events. Within this relationship, beats are essential in building character recognition, alignment, and allegiance.⁶³ In terms of recognition, every beat takes the time to establish (or re-establish) the identities of its characters through their names, roles, and relationships to one another. Newman includes this recognition strategy in serial television's general tendency to recap:

(Recapping) takes many forms, one of which is the perpetual naming of characters: in every beat, characters address each other by name, often several times in a two-minute segment. Along with naming comes role reiteration: *Alias* (ABC, 2001–) constantly reminds us that Jack and Irina are Sydney's parents; Giles is always reminding Buffy (*Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, WB, 1997–2001) that he is her watcher; Joel on *Northern Exposure* (CBS, 1990–5) is often called 'Dr Fleishman,' even away from his practice, and his favourite leisure activity, golfing, reinforces his role stereotype.⁶⁴

The *Iliad*'s oral/aural narrative similarly creates character recognition through the repetition of names, patronyms, and epithets⁶⁵ in each of its beats.⁶⁶ The narrative does not just repeatedly name Hektor, but it augments his identity with repeated, metrically appropriate and often context-specific epithets: he is 'shining' (φαίδιμος) or 'man-killing' (ἀνδροφόνος).⁶⁷ The poem also enforces his role as the son of Priam, usually through his patronymic (Πριαμίδης, cf. 2.817, 5.684, etc.). These repetitions remind the audience who characters are while also reinforcing their relationships and social roles, both within the epic and within a larger tradition.

Just as beats work to establish and re-establish characters, they also work to establish and re-establish setting, time, and events.⁶⁸ These elements contribute to character alignment, as the narrative allows the audience to ‘attach’ to a character through their physical surroundings, and gives ‘access’ to that character as they participate in or respond to events. Allegiance builds as we judge characters’ actions, but also as we judge their responses to other actions, events, and characters. Beats build this allegiance by using character dialogue to recap previous events, in what Mittell calls ‘diegetic retelling.’⁶⁹ Whichever character re-tells an event gives his or her perspective on that event, just as whichever character (or characters) are told about an event react to that event:⁷⁰ these character responses to events effectively build character allegiance as much as (if not more than) events themselves. So beats constantly recap significant narrative events and provide new information about the emotional or real consequences those prior events have for characters.

Beats do not confine themselves to recapping past narrative events. In beats, characters frequently discuss past actions that have happened outside of the narrative’s timeframe,⁷¹ which creates character backstories and provides further opportunity for audience allegiance. Backstories deepen characters and create a history of the storyworld that other characters can share in, which contributes to the illusion that the storyworld and its characters are ‘real’.

At the same time, character dialogue or actions in beats often look forward to future events.⁷² This is particularly true of beats that establish ‘missions’, a common device in serial narratives, which can structure a beat sequence (Jon Snow tries to retrieve the dragonglass during the battle of Hardhome in *Game of Thrones*, S5E8), an episode (Carol and Maggie try to escape from the Saviours in *The Walking Dead*, S6E13), an arc (Brienne of Tarth vows to protect the Stark girls in *Game of Thrones*, from S2E8 onwards), or even a series (Battlestar Galactica tries to find ‘Earth’). The ‘mission’ can give all of these levels an end point that the audience can anticipate and look forward to, and obstacles for characters to overcome along the way.⁷³ Missions commonly appear in the *Iliad* as well, and serve similarly to keep the audience engaged. Helenos’s telling Hektor to go back to Troy in at 6.86–118 naturally creates audience expectation that Hektor will go to Troy in a future beat (he arrives in Troy at 6.237); just as surely as Zeus’s accepting Thetis’s ‘mission’ to help Achilles by giving glory to the Trojans creates anticipation for how that will play out (1.517–27; cf. 15.47–77; 18.70–7).⁷⁴

In looking backwards (*analepsis*) or forwards (*prolepsis*),⁷⁵ beats do not revisit every past event,⁷⁶ nor do they anticipate every future event.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, these narrative glances in both directions keep the audiences hooked, reinforcing

or revealing new aspects of what the audience already knows about events and characters, while they build anticipation for what comes next.⁷⁸

Beats, of course, do not exist on their own: they are always incorporated into and contribute to the larger structural units of serial narrative. While I will wait to discuss beat structure in episodes as it pertains to character below, it is worth noting here the strategies that both serial television and the *Iliad* use to transition between beats. Most beats correspond with a change of scene, so there is simply a direct cut to a different character, in a different location. These transitions become more diverse in more complicated scenes with multiple characters, like battle scenes, which are often made up of multiple beats that focus on a few key characters: a 'beat sequence.' *Game of Thrones*' magnificent episode 'Hardhome', for example, ends on an eighteen-minute battle sequence at Hardhome between the wildlings, the men of the Night's Watch, and the 'walkers.' As Erik Adams writes about the episode,

... Miguel Sapochnik overcomes initial frenzy to lay out an attack depicted in beat-by-beat intricacy. He's helped by the characters that [writers] David Benioff and D.B. Weiss have sent over the wall: Unlike 'Blackwater' and 'The Watchers on the Wall' [other 'battle' episodes], we only have to keep track of Jon Snow and Tormund Giantsbane after the dead breach the gates. (The author now recognizes and acknowledges the delegates of the Eddison Tollett Fan Club, so I guess there are technically three entry points into the fracas.) This keeps the sequence's ambitions in check, but makes sense out of the hack-and-slash chaos. It also drives home the predicament facing our protagonists: The dread sinks deeper because 'Hardhome' makes its centerpiece feel like a handful of warriors facing an army of thousands.⁷⁹

In addition to these three main characters, 'Hardhome's battle beats also track a wildling giant, a tall, bald, wildling leader, and a wildling woman named Karsi, as well as the head of the army of the dead, known among fans as 'The Night King'. So the scene does not change, but the sequence involves many beats that move back and forth between these main characters, and some minor characters as well. Transitions between these beats occur through cuts (a sharp move from one character to another, with intermittent birds-eye views), following a character (the camera tracks Jon Snow as he runs through the fighting in the camp), or following a gaze or perception (the Night King watches Jon Snow from above the battle). These beat transitions compare easily to Scott Richardson's breakdown of what he calls 'scene changes' (but I would argue are beat transitions) from the *Iliad*,⁸⁰ which include 'physically following a character', 'following the perception of a character', and 'cuts between different characters who are at different locations.'⁸¹

Episodes

Sequential beats build into the next larger structural unit of serial television: the episode.⁸² Considering episodes seemingly presents the most difficult challenge in using the poetics of serial television to better understand the *Iliad*. Commercial interests generally compel television episodes to be a certain length and to appear at a certain frequency. Even on cable networks and in online venues, television serials tend to follow the conventions of having a pre-determined number of episodes in a season that are around the same length.⁸³ But ‘television’ is changing, morphing both creatively and formally beyond traditional constraints. The *Iliad*’s irregular ‘episodes’ might find a closer parallel with Louis C.K.’s online show *Horace and Pete* (louisck.net, 2016–): its episodes vary in length from thirty to sixty-seven minutes, and its narrative progress continued without giving any hint to how many episodes there would be. The show ended after ten episodes, with no indication that the tenth episode would be the show’s finale. One week after sharing the final episode, Louis C.K. wrote in an email to his fans:

Hi. So. That was it. I didn’t want to say, in the last email, that it was the last episode. Because I didn’t want you to know, as you watched the episode, that it would be the last one. But yeah, obviously, That was it . . . I chose to do the show this way, knowing that it would be a quiet and strange experiment and that only a few of us would take part in this stage of it, that has just ended. The creating, unfolding and watching of the show, one episode at a time, from nothing. I am grateful to all of you that took this trip with me the way you did, not knowing what you were getting, how much you were getting or how it would all feel. I was right there with you. I didn’t know how any of this would go or feel.⁸⁴

This kind of ad hoc production style suggests the *Iliad*’s own, possibly additive means of production,⁸⁵ and likewise points to the *Iliad*’s irregular episodes.

Judging the exact irregularity of the *Iliad*’s episodes, or performance segments, has been a central debate in Homeric scholarship, with a primary focus on how the *Iliad*’s book divisions came to be, and how they might correspond to composition and performance.⁸⁶ If we take the *Iliad*’s later-imposed book divisions as correspondent to possible performance breaks,⁸⁷ its whole performance would have twenty-four ‘episodes’, ranging in length from just over a half hour (Book 19, at 424 lines) to over an hour (Book 23, at 897 lines).

If we disregard the *Iliad*’s book divisions and take it as a whole poem that would have different breaks in its original performances,⁸⁸ then the poetics of

serial television can aid a more critical consideration of its possible performance breaks. The *Iliad*, like serial television, has a number of episodes where certain problems play to their resolution, while other strands of the narrative are left dangling. This creates different kinds of pleasures for the serial's audience: immediate pleasures for resolution within an episode, but anticipatory pleasure (and greater delayed pleasure) for the resolutions of those storylines left open.⁸⁹ Audiences rely on immediate pleasures not just because they help us through a longer narrative, but also because not everyone will stay for the *whole* story, when the whole story is many hours (or days, or years) long. So serial narratives balance closure and aperture, allowing the closure of a single, central issue in each 'episode', while maintaining several open story strands that keep audiences looking forward to resolutions in later episodes.⁹⁰

This tension between episode closure and aperture plays out in different ways in different shows: some shows *always* end on a cliffhanger, like the first season of *Alias*,⁹¹ others prefer to end an episode on the scene that resolves that episode's key problem (like *Sopranos*), or the scene just after a problem's resolution, showing the implication of that resolution moving forward. Defining episodes then requires a look at both at the end of one episode as well as the beginning of the next: does the action pick up where the last left off? Does the beat structure build in recaps of action from the last episode? Most television shows bridge the gap between episodes with a 'previously on . . .' clip before each episode. But some shows, like *The Good Wife* (CBS, 2009–), always start a new episode *in media res* without any 'previously on . . .' clip to place the viewer: this means that all significant information from previous episodes emerges in the present episode through diegetic retelling in character dialogue, or, occasionally, in flashback. *The Good Wife* also quite regularly does not include any of these recaps of previous episodes until after its title sequence, which is often anytime between eight and twelve minutes into the programme.⁹² Most shows alternate techniques in moving between episodes (consider *The Walking Dead*, or *Game of Thrones* or *Hannibal*). These serial strategies from television can be helpful in guessing at where a performer might take a break in the *Iliad*'s serial structure. The glory of live performance means that an *Iliad* performer could choose his own strategy for a given 'episode',⁹³ whether to leave a cliffhanger or resolve a problem. I imagine that a poet/performer would most likely plan out his breaks beforehand, with rough sketches in mind of where breaks might be most affective for an audience. Or, as can happen with live performance, the performer might choose to take a break based on any number of external factors: Are the audience into it? Is it time for dinner? Does he need a drink? Either way, the *Iliad*'s text that

survives, as I will show, certainly implies where breaks *can* happen, based on when and where important recaps occur.⁹⁴

While the sequence of beats that make up an episode generally focus on a single problem that finds resolution at the episode's end, these beats in combination also contribute significantly to character construction. Most episodes follow one central storyline with two to three other storylines simultaneously, switching back and forth between characters and their problems with each beat. So an episode can help audience recognition as it creates a hierarchy of character importance through how many beats it devotes to each character. On one extreme, an entire episode can keep an audience aligned with a single character: Mittell draws attention to *Lost's* strategy of character-centric episodes, like a 'Kate-centric' episode.⁹⁵ As Mittell says, 'The effect of such centric episodes is to deepen viewers' knowledge of particular characters, providing access to their backstories (or futures) . . .'⁹⁶ At the other extreme, some episodes introduce characters only to quickly dispose of them.⁹⁷ In *Star Trek*, it became a cultural gag that if an episode introduced a new character wearing an engineering/operations/security red uniform, he would die that same episode, hence the term 'red-shirts.'⁹⁸ We see something similar along this spectrum in the *Iliad*, where an audience aligns with a character for a length of time in battle, particularly if that character has the backing of a god, in what we call an *aristeia*, or 'time of excellence' (i.e. Diomedes, Agamemnon, Patroklos, or Achilles). But on the other end of the spectrum, many of the *Iliad's* characters are named only once, and only at the moment of their often-gruesome death.⁹⁹

Beyond simply creating hierarchies of narrative importance, episodes also reveal different aspects of a character in its diverse interactions within a melodramatic alignment structure. Discussing *The Sopranos* (HBO, 1999–2007), Anthony Smith writes that in an episode's

multi-plot structure, the juxtaposition of storylines often creates additional meaning,¹⁰⁰ and that 'this multi-plot format contributes towards *Sopranos* characters' much heralded complexities . . . by permitting characters to be seen from a multitude of viewpoints, [multi-plot storytelling] brings their complex natures to the fore.¹⁰¹

Smith demonstrates this dynamic with the lead character of *NYPD Blue* (ABC, 1993–2005), Andy Sipowicz, who interacts with both criminals and his family:

Sipowicz . . . is both notoriously thuggish, abusive, and prejudiced, yet still a loving family man. The episode construction conventions of television drama

thus help facilitate the comprisal of these characters' perhaps seemingly paradoxical components.¹⁰²

The *Iliad* operates similarly: Hektor stands out as an affecting character precisely because we see him both on the battlefield and with his family, often in the same 'episode' (as in the possible episodes of Book 6, or Book 22).¹⁰³

Besides showing us different sides of a character, the order and diversity of beats in a given episode can also create important juxtapositions that also contribute to characterization. For *The Sopranos*, Smith discusses the frequent jarring juxtapositions between mafia and domestic scenes, which implicitly point to the tensions in character roles between the two worlds, even if the same character does not appear in these subsequent scenes.¹⁰⁴ In discussing soap episode strategies, Robert Allen says 'Because serials cut between scenes enacting separate plotlines, the viewer is prompted to ask not only "Where is each of these plotlines going?" but also "What might be the relationship between different plotlines?"'¹⁰⁵ Character action or dialogue in one beat that establishes allegiance can affect audience allegiance to the characters in the following beat, even if the scenes are seemingly unrelated.

Arcs

While episodes provide closure for specific character problems before a break in the serial's narrative, they usually leave some problems unresolved, or 'dangling',¹⁰⁶ which subsequent episodes take up, to form a character 'arc'. 'Arcs' can last from a few beats to several episodes – some can last for the whole narrative. Newman explicitly understands arcs as character-based: 'arc is to character as plot is to story . . . although each episode, sweeps period, season and series . . . may have its own unity, each character's story can be individuated, spatialized as an overlapping all of these and all of the other characters' arcs.'¹⁰⁷ Character arcs can shift narrative focus from one 'problem' to another, but they are always anchored in the character themselves. For Hektor, the 'episode' that overlaps with Book 6 focuses on his mission to Troy and its resolution. But Hektor's arc stretches over many episodes, from the first time that Achilles mentions him in Book 1 to his death in Book 22, and beyond, to the epic's last line, which summarizes the Trojans' funeral for him.

Each character in the *Iliad* has an arc: red-shirts' arcs can last just one beat; Achilles' arc lasts the whole of the epic. The *Iliad*'s melodramatic structure

extend beyond the narrative itself. These ‘real’ characters provide audiences, through their allegiances, with an emotional anchor that helps the audience track the story as it progresses: as Newman says, ‘we don’t just want to know what’s going to happen but what’s going to happen to Pembleton and Bayliss (*Homicide: Life on the Street*, NBC, 1993–9), Buffy and Spike, Angela and Jordan ...’¹¹²

This ‘reality’ derives from the nature of serial narrative itself, from the length of time that an audience spends with these characters, but also the time we spend away from them. Characters in serial

appear to live continuously between episodes, they grow and change with time, and have active ‘memories’ or previous events ... the constant repetition of a character means that characters ‘live’ in similar time scales to their audience. They have a past, a present, and a future that appear to exceed their textual existence ... they will return tomorrow, or next week, and the end of each episode has built into it the expectation of the next.¹¹³

Again, beats’ character conversations often involve backstories that give the impression that the character has a lived past outside of the narrative framework.¹¹⁴ Hopes or predictions for the future likewise give the impression that the character will live beyond the narrative’s end, even if, like in the case of the *Iliad*’s Achilles, it might not be for long beyond that boundary (cf. 22.365f.).

As we saw in discussing beats, characters also remember and respond to events that have happened within the narrative, and look forward to events that will happen within the narrative. The narrator himself also works to create these kinds of continuities, which also suggest a ‘reality’ for the story’s characters. When the narrative leaves Paris and Helen in Book 3, they are making love (3.447f); when Hektor ‘finds’ them in Book 6, well over two hours of performance time later, they are still in their bedroom, Paris preparing his weapons and Helen ordering the women about the housework (6.321–4). This consistency of space setting gives the impression of continuity, just as the change in activities indicates the passage of time as a shared experience between the audience and the other characters. Both invite the audience to ‘fill in the gaps’, engaging further with the character’s arc.

Character change

It is worth questioning whether this illusion of lived continuity that character arcs create over time can also point towards character ‘change’ or ‘growth’. Critics

of Homeric characterization have complained of epic characters' static-ness, holding them against the bar of the modern novel's 'developed', 'round' characters.¹¹⁵ Television theorists, too, have perceived a lack of character development within the serial form. Pearson describes character elaboration or accumulation, rather than development, in the television serial:

Over the course of a long-running series, the routine augmenting of traits and biographies for novelty purposes can lead to highly elaborated characters. But a highly elaborated character is not the same as a well-developed character . . . it's more accurate to talk about character accumulation and depth than it is to talk about character development.¹¹⁶

Henrik Örnebring considers this dynamic in terms of 'character showcasing', i.e. providing discursive opportunities not to develop and change the character but to let the character do 'what he/she does best'.¹¹⁷ Mittell accepts Pearson's notion of 'character accumulation' or 'elaboration', but he suggests that the serial form itself 'gradually reveals aspects of character over time so that these facets of the character feel new to the audience, even if they are consistent and unchanging character attributes'.¹¹⁸ In other words, serial narratives create character dynamism by revealing new character information over time, particularly through character relationships and 'life' events, rather than 'developing' the character itself.

So serial narratives can create the illusion of character change through these gradual revelations of new character attributes. How this differs from 'real' change is quite hard to know. As Newman says, 'Continuing stories make characters more likely to undergo significant life events and changes. In reaction to these changes in circumstances the characters themselves are more likely to change or at least to grow'.¹¹⁹ We can see this tension between character 'change' and character deepening with a character like *Game of Thrones*' Jaime Lannister. In the first episode, Jaime pushes a child, Bran Stark, out of high window because the boy caught him having sex with his sister. This seemingly establishes Jaime as a 'villain'. But over time, Jaime is captured in war-time (twice), loses a hand, and becomes friends with Brienne of Tarth: these events and relationships reveal new aspects of his character that quickly made him a fan favourite. How can we tell the difference between seeing a new side of a character, or seeing a *real* character change?

Mittell notes how external character markers, like a new haircut or wardrobe, as well as character's own proclamations about themselves and what others say about them can all give the audience access to interior character changes after

major events.¹²⁰ Jaime Lannister was a famous swordsman before he loses his sword hand in captivity—then, when he finally makes it back home, he also cuts his hair: this marks him as a changed man from his experience beyond the physical evidence of the lost hand itself, though he remains recognizably ‘Jaime’. In the same episode where Jaime first sports the shorter hair, his sister/lover Cersei rebuffs his advances, and he says to her, ‘Something’s changed.’ She responds, ‘Everything’s changed! You come back after all this time with no apologies and one hand, and you expect everything to be the same?’¹²¹ So through both external markers and character dialogue, the narrative establishes that Jaime has changed, and so too, then, must his relationship with Cersei. Achilles provides the most obvious Iliadic example of this kind of character change: not only does he wear new armour after the death of Patroklos, but Achilles explicitly claims that Patroklos’s death has changed him, when he explains to the Trojan Lykaon that he will kill him rather than ransom him alive, as he would have (and had done) *before* Patroklos’s death (21.99–113).¹²²

But these changes, too, are often not permanent, or representative of what we might think of as ‘character development’. Mittell notes that:

most of such changes in a serial are either temporary, attributed to an external factor that dissipates over the course of an episode or short arc, or only midlevel shifts in behaviors and attitudes, rather than high-level transformations of core morality and ethics that would prompt a change in our allegiances.¹²³

While we have yet to see the totality of Jaime Lannister’s arc which might give us some clue of whether or not his character had truly ‘changed’, the *Iliad* gives us an Achilles in Book 24 that does seem to show a man returning to his own core values.

Character overhaul

In the repertoire of temporary changes that serial narratives can put their characters through, without risking alienating their audience’s core allegiance with a character, one such change is a ‘character overhaul’. Mittell defines a character overhaul as ‘where a character undergoes a dramatic, sudden shift, often tied to a supernatural or fantastic situation.’¹²⁴ Some shows use these interventions as a standard part of their narrative strategies: *Dollhouse* (FOX, 2009–10), *iZombie* (CW, 2015–) and *Sense8* (Netflix, 2015–) all frequently change the personalities of their protagonists through external interventions.

The *Iliad* does this too, when gods possess its heroes for short periods of time, often changing their outward appearance and capabilities during that time known as an *aristeia* (or, 'time of excellence') on the battlefield (like Diomedes in Book 5, Agamemnon in Book 11, and Patroklos in Book 16).¹²⁵ These character overhauls force the audience to reassess their character recognition, but the change rarely lasts long enough to truly challenge audience allegiance.

Character transformation (Stockholm syndrome?)

In rare cases, a television serial will sustain or develop character change over the entirety of its character arc. While I do not believe that this is true of any of the characters in the *Iliad*, examining how allegiance works in these cases can also be helpful for thinking about Iliadic characterization. *Breaking Bad* creator Vince Gilligan set out with a clear goal in mind in creating his show's protagonist Walter White: 'We're going to take Mr. Chips, and we're going to turn him into Scarface.'¹²⁶ Over the course of five seasons, Walter White changes from a sympathetic family man with cancer to a morally reprehensible drug kingpin. But audiences still watched, with the show's finale garnering four times the number of viewers than its premiere had.¹²⁷ Gilligan himself said of his lead character:

I have kind of lost sympathy for Walt along the way . . . I find it interesting, this sociological phenomenon, that people still root for Walt. Perhaps it says something about the nature of fiction, that viewers have to identify on some level with the protagonist of the show, or maybe he's just interesting because he is good at what he does. Viewers respond to people who are good at their job, even when they are bad.¹²⁸

This has obvious implications for how we understand the *Iliad*, whose characters often operate far outside our own moral frameworks. As we acclimate ourselves to the characters' worlds, we form allegiances with those characters not just within *our* moral framework, but also within *their* moral framework. We root for the Iliadic heroes who are good at killing because that is a standard metric of their world.

Jason Mittell discusses Walter White's transformation at length, and he has a slightly different take on why the audience continues to follow him:

(for cuing our allegiance to Walt) . . . we have our own memories of who Walt used to be, as long-term viewers can recall him as being decent and ethical, if

boring and depressed. Our serial memories help sustain lingering allegiance, despite his irredeemable acts along the way.¹²⁹

Mittell suggests that Walt ‘coasts’ on our shared memories with the character, as though we have lived through something together. This means that even if new character revelations contribute to our allegiance shifting away from a character, (my own allegiance had shifted entirely to Jesse, Walt’s partner in crime, by the end of *Breaking Bad*), we still remain emotionally engaged in that character. For better or worse, I still wanted to know what would happen to Walter White. Familiarity breeds allegiance, as do the memories of characters and audiences of that character, even if they contrast with that character’s other behaviours. This applies to many characters in the *Iliad*, but especially to Hektor and Patroklos, as character memories (along with our own) continue to shape our impression of that character alongside or even against our *experience* of that character.

How does this character impression form, through these structural units of beats, episodes, and arcs? While recognition, alignment, and allegiance help to describe how an audience *relates* to a character through the length of its arc, they do not wholly explain how the character exists within the audience’s mind. Recognition necessarily implies categorization, as audiences ‘sort’ characters based on the character’s most obvious identity and role attributes into basic categories that are defined within the audience’s own cultural context, such as gender, age, race, and social role. These categorizations happen nearly instantaneously, but they are culturally conditioned and can be broken down and transformed as the audience’s external norms are slowly merged and adapted to the narrative’s internal norms. We get used to a character as a ‘warrior’ or a ‘drug dealer’ beyond our own prejudices as we move through the narrative. So our allegiances are schema-based,¹³⁰ but malleable. As David Miall says of reader affect, ‘there is also the sequential, experiential aspect of reading which uncovers ambiguity, indeterminacy, and conflict between schemata, and these require the reader’s interpretative activity, during which schemata are shifted, transformed, or superseded.’¹³¹

This process broadly correlates to the social cognition model of impression formation in considering other people. In this process, schemata are used in combination with ‘piecemeal integration’, in both serial and parallel processes. We have seen how serial narrative constructs opportunity for character recognition, alignment, and allegiance. In a nearly mirror process in our real lives, when we meet someone, we initially categorize them, we rate their personal relevance to us, then, if we have the energy, we confirm or negate our previous

categorizations, we re-categorize, and finally, we go through piecemeal integration.¹³² In piecemeal integration, we take in all of the disparate pieces of information that we have about a person and integrate them into a coherent impression, averaging out what we know of the character so that some character attributes that do not fit within the integration are left out. This continuum model of impression formation is a dynamic process that continues up until the point where we have no new information about a person or a character to incorporate into it.¹³³ This piecemeal integration explains why audiences can ‘average out’ some of Walter White’s worse features, or why we tend to view Iliadic heroes as ‘typical’ rather than as the nuanced, messy characters that the *Iliad* actually presents.

At the same time, piecemeal integration implies extraordinary audience engagement: we only make it to this stage if we have already rated a character significant enough to try to accommodate their multiple facets. We can apply this process in tandem with Smith’s levels of character engagement to our own experience of characters in serial narratives. The narrative takes time to establish character, through repeating and reinforcing names, roles, and relationships, so that we recognize that character and how they fit into the story. This recognition forces character categorization, and, as the narrative progresses forces re-categorization, as we acquire the narrative’s internal norms. Re-categorization and evaluation also happen through character alignment, as the narrative then attaches to that character’s behaviour, and provides access to their inner thoughts. This time ‘getting to know’ a character, both in relation to our own cultural schema and to the storyworld’s schema, finally invites audience allegiance to the character. Then we become emotionally invested in what happens to them, rooting for some and against others, usually in accordance with the rules of their storyworld. Characters can change and can display diverse or even ‘inconsistent’ behaviours, but these changes and inconsistencies often serve to further engage audiences and, through that engagement, can increase audience allegiance. The *Iliad*’s serial narrative aims then, not for character consistency,¹³⁴ but for coherence,¹³⁵ as it challenges character recognition and constantly switches character alignments, but all the while inspires character allegiance.¹³⁶

Experiencing Hektor

This book will explore how the *Iliad* constructs Hektor’s character through a serial analysis of the *Iliad* itself, with sub-sections determined by beats, sequence,

or episode transitions as they are most relevant to Hektor. The object of the book is not to determine who Hektor is, but rather to demonstrate where the epic invites its audiences to think on who he is. The body of the book divides into three main parts: *Enter Hektor* explores the *Iliad's* establishment of its storyworld and how it slowly introduces Hektor and constructs audience recognition, alignment, and allegiance with him; *Killing Time* looks at the middle section of the epic's narrative, and shows how alignment and allegiance shift and change through character absence, re-introduction, overhaul, and re-establishment; finally, *Ends* looks at how the narrative starts to resolve its story arcs, with some special focus on how the narrative uses character memory to leave lasting character impressions. The book then mirrors the *Iliad's* own serial strategies, peeling back its many layers of character information that it imparts piece-by-piece over the length of its narrative, examining how each beat engages audience recognition, alignment, and allegiance. This approach stems from my own endlessly frustrating and addictive experience of Hektor.

Hektor has generally been the character that I respond to most strongly in the *Iliad*, but that alone has given me little insight into his character. Hektor is, of course, the defender of Troy,¹³⁷ but he fails in that role. What might be said about Hektor? He is brave.¹³⁸ He is a coward. He is a great fighter. He is a mediocre fighter.¹³⁹ He makes mistakes.¹⁴⁰ He goes mad.¹⁴¹ He is civil.¹⁴² He is a gentle man.¹⁴³ He is cruel, boastful and vindictive. He is delusional.¹⁴⁴ He is tall, handsome.¹⁴⁵ He is constrained by his own masculinity.¹⁴⁶ He is connected to femininity.¹⁴⁷ He is a type.¹⁴⁸ He is a character.¹⁴⁹ He exists only as a foil for Paris.¹⁵⁰ He serves as a 'whipping-boy for the Greeks.'¹⁵¹

I am not sure that any of these arguments matter: some of them might be true, some of them are certainly true, some of them are certainly true only in specific scenarios or character relationships. I have been working on Hektor for nearly a decade now, and still I feel that he is unknowable and still I want to know him more. Perhaps this is because he is drawn so well in all his different facets that jut out at odd angles, depending on the situation he is in or the other character(s) that he is with. As the above paragraph shows, I have never found a clean paradigm that I can fit Hektor into, nor a list of traits that I can easily ascribe to him.¹⁵² Hektor resembles Cy Twombly's painting of his shade: he has a form, but it is petalled, blurry – solid, and yet indistinct.¹⁵³ Hektor exists, but always in between: in between what he says and what he does and how someone else responds; in between the moment that I experience him and the impression that I hold of him in my mind.

The challenges of understanding Hektor speak to the challenges of serial narrative. Any audience member that experiences a serial narrative must build

and rebuild their understanding of both character and story throughout their experience. Each beat of the narrative might add new information, or recap significant past information, or reshape that past information in ways that contributes to characterization and builds anticipation for future events. Episodes resolve and leave us satisfied, but dangling story lines keep us coming back for more. Throughout, the *Iliad* uses its melodramatic alignment structure to keep shifting audience alignment between different characters, building a complex network of audience allegiance to diverse characters. As our allegiances grow, we become more invested in character arcs so that we keep coming back to find out what happens to our favourite characters next.¹⁵⁴ Breaks between episodes can also change our understanding: at a performance, we might ask our neighbour if they remember a detail we have forgotten, or find out who their favourite character is, which might influence our own views. In between television episodes, we might talk to our colleagues, or scour the internet for commentary and reviews, looking for interpretations that reinforce or challenge our own. Serial narratives become interwoven with our lives, their length and their focus on characters and character responses ripe for social and parasocial modes of cognitive engagement.¹⁵⁵

So this book will not account for who Hektor is, but will demonstrate the incredible way that the *Iliad's* serial poetics construct him within a melodramatic alignment structure, in all his ambiguity and multiplicity, in all his coherence and continuity, for audiences to engage with. The greatest beauty of the *Iliad* is that it encourages so many character alignments to always keep us engaged: we root for multiple characters, even when they are against one another. When asked about the complexity of his characters in his novels that make up the series the *Song of Fire and Ice*, the inspiration for HBO's *Game of Thrones*, George R.R. Martin said

I've been always very impressed by Homer and his *Iliad*, especially the scene of the fight between Achilles and Hector. Who is the hero and who is the villain? That's the power of the story and I wanted something similar to my books. The hero of one side is the villain of the other side.¹⁵⁶

Enter Hektor

This chapter looks at how the *Iliad's* serial narrative establishes the primary storylines and its main characters within the first several 'episodes' of its performance. The *Iliad's* first six books would take nearly five hours of performance time, and would consist of several episodes. As Hektor hardly appears in the first two hours of the epic, I will focus first on how the narrative create anticipations for his character as it builds its storyworld, with a special interest in how the structure and order of its beats and episodes works building recognition, alliance and eventually allegiance with Hektor.

In media res

What is it like to enter a new world? We do it all the time when we watch television serials, where the narrative works to very quickly establish multiple storylines, characters, locations, and sometimes, temporalities, with preliminary work towards the relationships between these different narrative aspects. *Game of Thrones* opens with three men on horses behind an opening gate in a wintry landscape; we follow them through a tunnel, which opens up on one side of a huge, snowy wall – we enter the woods with them. One man finds body parts in the snow, a young girl pinned to a tree, a sword through her torso. They have a conversation about these 'wildlings' that have been killed; they talk of their orders and their desire to get back to the Wall. One man tells another that if he runs south they will catch him as a deserter and behead him. The three go back to where the first man found the bodies. The body parts are missing. Soon, the three are attacked, seemingly by zombies, including the young girl whom we saw pinned to the tree. The one man who was told he would be beheaded watches a shadowy figure behead one of his companions, toss the head towards him. The scene ends and cuts to the title sequence.

No names are given in this sequence, and, in fact, none of these characters are 'important' – the next scene shows that the one man does escape, only to be

beheaded by Ned Stark outside of Winterfell. The show has literally thrown its audience into a strange land full of strangers. The costumes, the size of the snowy wall, the zombies, all indicate to the show's contemporary media audience that they are not in a realistic world: these play on tropes of fantasy and of horror. The *Game of Thrones* pilot asks its audience, regardless of whether they have read the source novels, to situate themselves in a new world that has at least four physical locations (the Wall, plus the title-cued locations of Winterfell, King's Landing, and Pentos) and around twenty-five speaking characters, of whom over twenty are named. Part of the excitement of watching a new show is the ludic aspect,¹ the puzzle-solving challenge as we start to piece together the show's world and where its characters fit into it.

The *Iliad* expertly builds in details over its first episodes to introduce its characters, their relationships, and where *this* story fits into a tradition of stories about Troy.² The first episode follows the actions of multiple characters: Chryses, Achilles, Agamemnon, Thetis, and, to a lesser extent, Zeus and Odysseus. While the first episode mentions Hektor, its primary focus is on the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, a long beat sequence that sets the events of the *Iliad* into motion. Most serials, even those with many characters, can only balance three or four (often intersecting) storylines within a given episode. *Game of Thrones* may have nearly thirty main characters, but most episodes are split between three or four locations and follow just a few of the major characters. Some weeks we do not see certain characters at all – most prominently, the show's fifth season excluded the story arc of Bran Stark, one of the main characters since the show's pilot, completely.

The first beats of the *Iliad* likewise introduce many characters, but constrain themselves to three storylines. The first storyline introduces the priest Chryses, who wants his daughter, the captive Chryseis, returned by Agamemnon (Apollo also plays a role in this storyline). The second sees Achilles challenge Agamemnon about returning Chryseis, and Agamemnon take Achilles' Briseis instead, spurring Achilles to withdraw from battle and to ask his mother, the goddess Thetis, for help. The third storyline follows Thetis to Zeus, and sees Zeus promise Thetis to help Achilles by punishing the rest of the Achaians. Of these storylines, the first is resolved within the first episode, as Agamemnon does return Chryseis to her father, bringing audience satisfaction to one problem to be overcome. But the remaining two storylines – Achilles' withdrawal from the war and Zeus's aid against the Achaians – will continue for many episodes before reaching resolution, determining most of the events still to come in the epic.

Diegetic introduction: 1.233–350

And where, in all this, is Hektor? Just as Mittell describes recaps within character conversation as ‘diegetic retelling’,³ we might think of character introduction in conversations as ‘diegetic introduction’. In the beats of serial narrative, other characters will often speak about a character before he or she finally shows up in the narrative, building audience anticipation for that character’s eventual entrance. Television serial narratives frequently use this strategy, particularly when drawing on traditional material: we might think of the delayed introduction of *Game of Thrones*’ Tywin Lannister, who, though mentioned as early as the first episode, does not appear until the seventh in the show’s first season.⁴ In *Game of Thrones*’ pilot, siblings Cersei and Jaime Lannister talk, and Jaime admits how scared he was of their father as a child. This reference to their father is the serial narrative’s first oblique introduction of Tywin Lannister. Over the first six hour-long episodes of the television series, several other characters make mention of him, building an expectation of a man who seems universally formidable to both his enemies and members of his family. Charles Dance’s Tywin finally appears on screen in the seventh episode: stony-faced, sharp-tongued, aggressively cleaning a dead deer as he speaks to his son Jaime, barely looking up at him, tearing him down with every word. Tywin Lannister fulfils expectations, and even though the audience knows how Jaime feels about his father, it is still a startling scene to see the normally confident Jaime shrivel in his presence. Perhaps one of the most anticipated entrances in contemporary serial television has been that of the character Negan, an antagonist to the group that Rick Grimes leads, in the zombie drama *The Walking Dead* (AMC, 2010–), based on a comic series of the same name. The character’s casting was announced in November 2015, not quite halfway through the show’s sixth season. This built audience anticipation for Negan to be a major character in the second half of the show’s season, and throughout the second half of the season, characters have made reference to him, or even claimed to *be* him. But only in the season’s finale does Negan finally appear, to seemingly kill off one of the main characters.⁵ In a similar way, the *Iliad* begins to introduce Hektor as a major character through the dialogue of other characters before the narrator makes any direct comment on Hektor or before Hektor himself becomes an actor in the plot.⁶ The *Iliad* delays its introduction of Hektor and does not reveal him until the end of Book 2, at least two hours into a performance of the whole epic.

Achilles first introduces Hektor in the fiery conclusion to his long argument-exchange with Agamemnon. Ending their argument over the captive women,

Achilles swears an oath-threat to Agamemnon that he will regret driving Achilles out of the fighting through this conflict (1.233–44). In his oath, Achilles angrily throws Agamemnon's sceptre to the ground, threatening him: 'In the future, no matter how much you grieve, you won't be able to do anything when many fall and die at the hands of man-slaughtering Hektor' (τότε δ' οὐ τι δυνήσῃαι ἀχνύμενός περ/χραιομεῖν, εὖτ' ἄν πολλοὶ ὑφ' Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο/θνήσκοντες πίπτωσι, 1.241–3). This sworn introduction of Hektor creates a point of divergence. From here on in Achilles and Agamemnon's storylines will go their separate ways, while Achilles hints at Hektor's storyline on the horizon. Here, Achilles constructs Hektor as the epic's *real* antagonist, beyond this quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon. Achilles' threat presumes a pre-existing fear of Hektor on the part of the Achaians, and this implied fear instils an emotional curiosity for the audience: now we *want* to see this Hektor, who kills, who terrifies.⁷

The narrative physically demarcates the divergence of these character arcs as Achilles and Agamemnon go their separate ways within the Achaian camp (1.304–11): Achilles' point of withdrawal will be a physical space wherein his story arc will unfold for the next many, many hours.⁸ Their divergence also immediately results in two different 'missions' that create audience anticipation for future events and set the agenda for the next several beats.⁹ For Agamemnon, the mission becomes to send Chryseis on her way, and to take Briseis from Achilles, which he accomplishes in the next beat sequence (1.311–50).

Thetis: 1.351–611

Once Briseis has left, Achilles laments and calls to his mother, the sea-nymph Thetis, and, despite accusing her of already knowing the story (οἶσθα, 1.365), gives a long recap of everything from the sack of Thebe to Agamemnon's seizing of Briseis (1.365–92). This is the epic's first major recap, and Achilles' speech seems to wink at the audience, who also already knows what has happened, and why Achilles is upset. Achilles' recap brings the audience up to speed (including late-comers to the performance), reiterating the important plot point of his quarrel with Agamemnon.¹⁰ That Achilles' speech so thoroughly recaps the events of the previous beats might suggest that the performer can take a break before this beat: even without Achilles' being named at 1.351, his name comes back in within less than two minutes of performance time (1.364). Whether or not the performer chooses to take a break, Achilles' recap also creates backstory

in giving more details about the sack of Thebe that led to Agamemnon's taking Chryseis and setting the whole quarrel in motion (1.366–9), giving further depth to his character through creating the illusion of his character past. At the same time, Achilles' speech gives the audience access to his character through his motivations and goals.¹¹ Achilles follows up on the threat he made to Agamemnon in the earlier scene and he asks his mother to get Zeus to side with the Trojans against the Achaians, at least until Agamemnon realizes what a mistake he has made in his dishonouring Achilles (1.393–412; cf. 1.239–44).

Serial television sometimes also uses this kind of immediate repetition to reiterate that event's importance to the story, to add character perspective on a recent event, and to add information that builds anticipation for future events. In the first episode of *The Path* (Hulu, 2016–), we see Sarah follow her husband, Eddie, to a motel; she assumes that he is having an affair. Several beats later, we see the exact same shots, but this time the narrative also allows us to see *whom* Eddie meets in the hotel: a woman who has escaped the cult-like religion that Sarah and Eddie practice. This repetition increases the significance of the event, while its elaboration adds to our understanding of Eddie and builds anticipation for how this encounter will affect Eddie and his relationship with Sarah in future episodes.

Similarly in the *Iliad*, Achilles' conversation with Thetis recaps his decisive quarrel with Agamemnon while it gives us insight into Achilles and builds anticipation for Thetis's mission to Zeus. That anticipation pays off several beats later,¹² when Thetis approaches Zeus and he agrees to the 'mission' (1.493–527), which gives the audience a clue that the coming epic might unfold as Achilles has threatened it will. In these scenes the *Iliad* uses both analepses (here, Achilles' recap) and prolepses (here, Zeus's promise that events will unfold as Achilles hope they will) to place the audience within the frame of the story as a whole, and to build suspense going forward. This suspense emerges around the absent-but-implied Hektor, who was the agent in Achilles' initial threat. If Zeus has agreed to Achilles' mission, now we want to see how Hektor will enter into that plan.

In the next beat after Zeus's meeting with Thetis, the narrative attaches the audience to Zeus returning to Olympos, where the conflict with Hera that he predicted in the last scene happens because of his helping Thetis (1.536–69, fulfilling 1.518–27). But with Hephaistos's encouragement, Hera's anger subsides, and Zeus and Hera go to bed together (1.531–611). That resolves one potential problem that has arisen, which could give the performer another chance for a break, particularly as the next beat recaps the tension between the gods and its resolution.

Achaians assemble: 2.1–394

To fulfil his mission, Zeus sends a Dream to Agamemnon that sets the agenda for the beats to come in his orders for Agamemnon to arm the Achaians (2.1–15). The narrative attaches to the Dream as it goes down to Agamemnon, and the next several scenes deepen Agamemnon's character and reveal his goals and motivations, while fleshing out an array of secondary characters through their relationships to Agamemnon, all of whom have their own story arcs. Nestor, Odysseus, Menelaos and Diomedes all work as points of tension with Agamemnon, and form constellation points in the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure. In this 'episode', the debate between Agamemnon and these characters as to whether or not to remain at Troy replaces the first 'episode's' fight between Agamemnon and Achilles as the central conflict. These characters' speeches not only give us insight into who they are, where they are from, and what their character motivations are, but also fill in gaps in the narrative information that the audience has. For example, Nestor mentions that the Achaians outnumber the Trojans (2.125–33), and that the Achaians have been in Troy for nine years (2.134). Thersites complains about Agamemnon's treatment of Achilles (2.239f.), which recaps the first episode's quarrel, while it ramps up the tensions between the other Achaians in this storyline. Odysseus's speech takes us all the way back to Aulis (2.303), and the launching of the Achaian fleet for Troy; his recount of Kalchas's prophecy there (2.308–30) suggests that Troy will fall in its tenth year. Putting these pieces together increases our anticipation – not so much over the question as to whether Troy will fall, with us in the expedition's tenth year – but rather, will Troy fall in *this* story? Finally Achaians turn, once more, to fight against the Trojans (2.394). This resolution plays on Achilles' threat (1.239–44), hinting at an upcoming encounter with Hektor's Trojans.

Hektor on the horizon: 2.394–473

Agamemnon explicitly invokes Hektor in his prayer to Zeus before the Achaians prepare to head into battle (2.412–8). Nearly an hour of performance time has passed since Achilles threatened Agamemnon with of man-slaughtering Hektor cutting down his men (1.241–3). Now Agamemnon inverts this image as he prays to Zeus, as he imagines cleaving through Hektor's tunic with his bronze (Ἐκτόρεον δὲ χιτῶνα περὶ στῆθεσσι δαΐξαι/ χαλκῶ ῥωγαλέον, 2.416f.) with his

companions around him dying in the dust (2.412–8) in front of Priam's burning palace.¹³ Rather than giving in to Achilles' threat of Hektor killing his men, Agamemnon prays to kill Hektor.

In doing so, Agamemnon re-shapes the image of Hektor, not as the focus of a fragmented Achaians' fear, but instead, of a newly unified (with the exception of Achilles) Achaian aggression. When Agamemnon finishes his prayer, the narrative comments that Zeus will not bring the prayer to pass (οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ οἱ ἐπεκράϊαινε Κρονίῳν, 2.419), but it leaves *exactly* what will not come to pass ambiguously open; another half-clue for the audience to follow. Will Hektor live? Or will Agamemnon simply not be the one to kill him? Either way, the seed has been sown: in the eyes of the Achaians, Hektor is both future menace and future victim. And, much like Achilles' threat of Hektor, Agamemnon's prayer here suggests a past. Hektor must be well-established as an enemy in the minds of the Achaians for Agamemnon to make this prayer.

This puts the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, and the smaller tensions between the rest of the Achaians, temporarily on hold. The resolution of the Achaians to stay and fight together (with the exception of Achilles) suggests another possible break for the performer, who can stop between the extended similes that describe the Achaian army. The first simile describes the gleaming bronze of the marching troops as a forest fire on the mountain (2.455–9); the second the gathering troops along the plains of Skamandros as flocks of swans in their thousands like leaves and flowers (2.459–68); finally, the third names the Achaians as swarms of insects at 2.469–73, now advancing against Troy. A break between these last two similes would come after about thirty-five minutes of performance time, and the option would leave the audience with a wonderfully vivid image of the Achaians, for the first time, on the attack.

Catalogue: 2.474–785

With the Achaians and Troy named in the third simile, it stands as a perfect opportunity for a performer to bring an audience back into the action, after a possible short break. Before we get to actually meet Hektor, and after painting the vivid image of the Achaians on the move, the narrator calls on the Muses to help him recite the catalogue of ships. The catalogue serves as an extended introduction and re-introduction of many of the *Iliad's* main characters.¹⁴ This performance would last around a half hour: plenty of time to build up anticipation for an audience's first experience of the Trojans and Achaians in battle.¹⁵ But a long

time, too, in which we might lose track of Hektor altogether. In fact, the catalogue only mentions one Achaian to even fall at the hands of a Trojan: Protesilaos, 2.699–703, and gives us no name for the Dardanian who cut him down.¹⁶

But the catalogue *does* remember Achilles when the narrative lists Nireus as the second most beautiful man at Troy, after Achilles (2.671f.). The catalogue also includes Achilles himself and recaps that he sits apart because he grieves for Briseis. Here the narrator deepens his character with further backstory, filling in that Achilles took Briseis at Lyrnessos; at the same time, the narrator prepares the audience for his eventual return to battle (2.688–94). The narrator ends the catalogue by bringing in Achilles yet again when he asks the Muses for help to remember the horses who fought at Troy:¹⁷ here the narrator reminds us that Achilles' horses, like Achilles himself, are sitting this one out (2.769–73). The catalogue ends with another vivid simile, as the remaining Achaians march across the plain like thunder (2.780–5).

Here, too, we might imagine the performer taking a break, if he wanted to end on the strong cliffhanger of the charging Achaians: 'So the earth groaned beneath their feet as they charged, as they sped fast across the plain.' (ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα/ ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ' ὄκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο. 2.784f.) But it would be hard to sit through the catalogue without some pay-off. The audience wants to finally see the Trojans, and Hektor: everything in the last hour of performance time has them ready for a fight.¹⁸

Reveal: 2.786–810

The beat switches as the narrator changes audience alignment from the Achaian charge to Iris, Zeus's messenger, making her way to the Trojans. This transition matters, as the narrative did not show the audience the message from Zeus, or Zeus's instructions to Iris, before Iris's appearance, as they might expect with a message (cf. Zeus and the Dream, 2.5–34) – this omission means that the audience is not sure whom her message is for or what it will contain. Still, the two beats work perfectly together, as Iris brings the 'message' of the last beat's actions (the Achaians are on the move) to the Trojans in front of Troy.

In this beat, the narrative finally *shows* Hektor, when his name has only twice been said in over a hundred minutes of performance time, not including breaks. Iris approaches the Trojans before the gates of Priam's palace (2.788), disguised as Priam's son Polites (2.791). When Iris speaks, she aims her address at Priam (ὦ γέρον at 2.796), warning him that the vast army of the Achaians are on the

move (2.797–801 recaps 2.780–5): this recap would allow a break after the catalogue at 2.785. Then ‘Polites’ addresses Hektor directly (“Ἔκτωρ, 2.802). No narrative or character introduction has told the audience that Hektor is part of the Trojan assembly, nor where he is, nor how he looks, nor even that ‘Polites’ addresses him. So the vocative might shock an audience: man-slaughtering Hektor (1.242), whose tunic Agamemnon wants to cleave through with his bronze (2.416–8), is right beside them in the audience, when the performer as Iris as Polites calls him out by name.¹⁹

‘Polites’ orders Hektor that he ‘most of all’ command the leaders of the Trojans and their various allies to get into order (“Ἔκτωρ σοὶ δὲ μάλιστα’ ἐπιτέλλομαι, 2.802). So ‘Polites’ re-enforces Hektor’s role as field commander of the Trojans. Hektor does not respond, but ‘recognizes the goddess’s command and immediately dissolves the assembly’ (“Ἔκτωρ δ’ οὐ τι θεᾶς ἔπος ἠγνοίησεν,/ αἶψα δ’ ἔλυσ’ ἀγορήν, 2.807f.).

Trojan catalogue: 2.811–3.14

Once the Trojans get into their ranks, the narrative voice catalogues them and their allies. The narrator starts with Hektor, and repeats Hektor’s name and role, adding for the first time new character attributes, and the fact that he is Priam’s son:

Τρωσὶ μὲν ἠγεμόνευε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
 Πριαμίδης· ἅμα τῶ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι
 λαοὶ θωρήσσοντο μεμαότες ἐγχεῖησι.

Great, shining-helmed Hektor ruled the Trojans,
 the son of Priam, and with him the most and the best men by far,
 eager to fight with the spear.

2.816–8

Can you see Hektor? For the first time, the narrator gives physical clues to his appearance, using neutral to positive adjectives/epithets to describe Hektor, focusing on his great size and his shiny helmet.²⁰ Hektor cuts an imposing figure, and in this anticipation of battle, he is neither the aggressor nor the victim that Achilles and Agamemnon, respectively, painted him as.

But *where* this introduction appears in the order of this beat sequence increases audience anxiety around Hektor. First, there is the prayer/threat of Agamemnon against Hektor (2.412–8), followed by a *very* long list of Achaian

warriors (2.494–759), only one of whom has died at the hands of the Trojans (2.699–703); and within this catalogue, several references to Achilles, who will soon return (2.671f., 2.688–94, 2.769–73). Similes that describe the vastness of the Achaian force trigger the catalogue and bring it to a close, creating and reiterating an impression of its size as it approaches (2.780–5).²¹ Iris’s warning to Priam about just how many the Achaians are only aggravates our concern (again described with a simile, 2.800f.). Then Iris introduces Hektor. The ‘Trojan catalogue’ that follows does not mention Hektor again, but contributes to a growing sense of dread. The list is notably shorter than that of the Achaians (the Achaian catalogue is around twenty minutes long, 2.494–759; the Trojan catalogue is only about seven minutes long, 2.786–877), almost proving in the time it has taken to *hear* the lists that the Trojans are vastly outnumbered. More, the narrator includes information about who will die in the Trojan catalogue,²² providing ‘red-shirts’ alongside the main characters before battle even begins.²³ After Hektor, the catalogue names Aineias, and then on to Adrestos and Amphios, who went to war despite their father’s prophetic protests (2.832f.), since the ‘dark spirits of death led them’. Then after several other Trojan allies, the narrator comes to Chromis and Ennomos the bird-seer (2.858), who will be killed by Achilles in the river (2.860f. looks forward to Achilles’ slaughtering Trojans and Trojan allies in Book 21), and Nastes will suffer a similar fate (2.872–5).²⁴ The catalogue ends on Sarpedon and Glaukos, the leaders of Lykia (2.876f.).²⁵ So the narrative directly foreshadows the deaths of several minor characters in a catalogue that also contains Hektor and Sarpedon, two major characters that the audience might know from tradition will also die. All of these ordered details construct a sense of the danger that Hektor faces in the epic to come.

Enter Paris: 3.15–37

Just as with the end of the Achaian catalogue, the end of the Trojan catalogue leaves the coming battle dangling. More, the narrative omits Paris from the Trojan catalogue, so those in the audience familiar with tradition will still be waiting for his appearance. Paris is, after all, *supposed* to be the antagonist in the Trojan War.²⁶ I do not think that a performer would stop between these two scenes, as the narrator zooms out from Sarpedon to show both armies coming against one another, before quickly zooming back in on Paris. Much like the reveal of Hektor, Paris’s sudden appearance – godlike, wearing a leopard hide, carrying a bow, a sword and two javelins (3.16–20) – provides the pay-off for the

audience's anticipation for him, and for combat. The audience has now been waiting around a half hour for battle, since the Achaians resolved to again march against Troy (2.432); much longer than that for mention of Paris, as he has yet to appear at all in the *Iliad*. But Paris's introduction also subverts expectations that the narrative has built around Hektor. The narrative has taken the time to construct Hektor as someone to fear and fear for in his role as the leader of the Trojans. Paris appears from nowhere, and, later, disappears almost as fast in his Aphrodite-drawn mist (3.380–2).

Hektor and Paris: 3.38–75

The confrontation between Paris and Menelaos finally provides Hektor with a speaking role, and his interactions in Book 3 begin to bring his character into sharper focus. In this episode, the Achaians and the Trojans interact for the first time, the narrative heads to Troy for the first time, and, most importantly for our discussion, the characters of several of the Trojan characters deepen significantly.

Nearly as soon as Paris has jumped out of the frontlines to challenge the Achaians, he jumps back into the group of his companions, terrified of Menelaos (3.30–7). Hektor *sees* Paris' retreat (ιδῶν, 3.38), and the narrative follows his gaze in order to switch alignments to Hektor, who now speaks for the first time. Hektor's rebuke for his brother re-introduces Paris, while recapping what has just happened in Paris's failed confrontation with Menelaos. At the same time, Hektor's exchange with Paris serves as a 'character moment' that gives us insight into Hektor beyond his role as leader of the Trojans,²⁷ furthering audience recognition and alignment. The exchange provides crucial backstory to any audience members who might not know what is going on or who these characters are, while reinforcing information for those who do. Hektor starts by characterizing his brother: since the narrative has just introduced Paris in the prior beat, Hektor's characterization leaves a strong mark. Hektor addresses his brother as Δύσπαρι ('Bad-Paris!', 3.39): of course this paints Paris in a bad light, but it also suggests a closeness between the brothers, as Hektor not only calls him by a different name (his 'Trojan' name) than the narrator (cf. 3.16, 3.27, 3.30, 3.37), but he calls him a nickname that no one else in the epic will ever call him.²⁸ The narrative called Paris 'godlike', but Hektor counters this with 'pretty boy' (εἶδος ἄριστε, lit. 'best-looking', 3.39);²⁹ before also calling him 'girl-crazy' (γυναιμανές, 3.39); and 'cheater' (ἠπεροπευτὰ).³⁰ So Hektor challenges the

narrative's introduction of Paris (θεοειδής, 3.16) as a kind of iceberg characterization that sees only the surface but does not understand what lies beneath. This is certainly his concern about what the Achaians might think of his brother, as they might assume that his good looks correlate to Paris's being a brave warrior (3.43–5). Hektor's insults give the audience access to his own values, which he opposes to Paris's values: through this access, the narrative starts to build audience allegiance around both characters. Hektor's contempt for Paris goes so far that he wishes that his brother had died long ago, before he got married (αἴθ' ὄφελος ἄγονός τ' ἔμναι ἀγαμός τ' ἀπολῆσθαι, 3.40), before he ever met Helen and brought her across the sea. Here Hektor refers to the backstory of Paris's bringing Helen to Troy (so far only recapped during the catalogue, at 2.588–90). Hektor gives this backstory a further nod by bringing up Menelaos as Helen's husband at 3.52f. Hektor then continues adding character attributes to his brother: Paris plays the lyre, he has the gifts of Aphrodite, he has pretty hair, he's beautiful (3.54f.). With each of these character traits, Hektor gives us further access to his judgements about his brother. Finally, Hektor claims that the Trojans should have stoned him for what he did (3.56f.), calling the Trojans 'cowards': so he places himself at odds with the rest of the community. Hektor fills in quite a lot of character information in this short rebuke for his brother. With these reproaches, the narrative allows access to Hektor that an audience can use to build allegiance with his character, deciding whether or not they agree with him and what he has to say.

Paris's response does much of the same, giving us his view on Hektor while fleshing out their relationship dynamic and providing Paris's views on his own character attributes. He starts out, 'Hektor, you've told me off right – not more than what's right' (Ἔκτορ ἐπέι με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν, 3.59). Paris builds the illusion of their shared backstory with this phrase, as he suggests that he has gotten used to Hektor's criticisms and now he knows how to handle them. Then Paris quickly pivots to compliment his brother in a slightly cheeky way to allay the tension between them, reinforcing the image that the Achaians have painted of Hektor as the chief military presence on the Trojan side (cf. 1.242, 2.416f.).³¹ First he claims that Hektor's 'heart is always tireless, like an axe' (αἰεὶ τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὥς ἐστιν ἀτειρής, 3.60). Paris follows this extended simile by describing Hektor's 'mind' (νόος, 3.63) as 'fearless' (ἀτάρβητος, 3.63), and this might also be a sarcastic rebuttal to Hektor's rebuke, where Hektor claimed of Paris as having neither force nor courage in his thoughts (εἶδος ἔπ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσίν οὐδέ τις ἀλκή, 3.45). Paris finally commands Hektor not to dismiss the gods' gifts, but to go and sit the armies down, with a casual 'but

now, if you want me to fight . . .' (νῦν αὖτ' εἴ μ' ἐθέλεις πολεμίζειν, 3.67) that shows Paris's lackadaisical attitude as he suggests that Hektor set up a single combat between himself and Menelaos (3.67–75). Paris sets the rules of the fight as 'winner-take-all', so that Menelaos's win would mean a victory for the Achaians, and Paris's win would mean the Trojans could live on in peace. Even if we do not know how Troy falls, the story structure has set up Achilles' conflict with Agamemnon as the primary conflict, and already hinted at Achilles' return to battle: these earlier episodes would make any audience expect that peace now is a false possibility, but it peaks interest to see *how* it will show itself to be false.³² Paris's evaluations of Hektor also create a new layer of character information for the audience to process, against which they can now judge his subsequent actions.

The narrative gives access to Hektor as Paris's plan makes him happy (3.76): this, too, contributes to audience allegiance to his character. At the same time, Paris's plan for a single combat sets the agenda for the next several beats, laying out how it will come about and building anticipation for what will happen when Paris and Menelaos finally face off against one another.

Setting terms: 3.76–120

The narrative switches beats by remaining attached to Hektor as he goes between the armies to set up the single combat between Paris and Menelaos. As Hektor walks out, the Achaians try to hit him with their weapons (3.79–81), reminding us of his inverse role as 'Achaian enemy'; but as Agamemnon stops them, naming Hektor with the more neutral epithet, 'shiny-helmed' (κορυθαιολος, Ἐκτωρ, 3.83; cf. 2.861),³³ that role subsides slightly.

Hektor calls out to both armies and repeats Paris's terms for single combat (3.88–91 recaps 3.68–70), which allows the audience to compare Hektor's own response to the proposal to that of the Achaians. The Greeks stay silent (3.95), but Menelaos responds (3.97–110). He acknowledges that he has played a role in everyone's suffering, pointing to the backstory he shares with the Greeks, and then he hopes for a peace that can last between the sides once one of them has died (3.98–102). Finally, Menelaos agrees to the truce on the condition that Priam should be the one to take the oath, since his sons are 'arrogant' and 'untrustworthy' (ἐπεὶ οἱ παῖδες ὑπερφίαλοι καὶ ἄπιστοι, 3.106). So as Hektor and Paris characterized each other in the last beat, in very different ways, now Menelaos adds attributes to them both, creating ambiguity in their characterizations. Are the

brothers really more alike than they seem? Is this just an outsider's tendency to lump his enemies together? These questions call audience allegiances into question. In response to Menelaos's speech, the narrator tells us that the men on both sides are happy (3.111): this access to Menelaos's internal audience further shapes our anticipation, because whether we find our allegiance more with Paris or with Menelaos, their audience makes us more invested in a truce that we know cannot last. The beat ends on Hektor and Agamemnon sending to Troy and their camp, respectively, for the things needed for the oath (3.116–20), again looking forward to the beats to come as these 'missions' come to fruition.

Troy-time: 3.121–260

Summoning Priam gives the narrative a chance to change scenes, but it contravenes a conventional scene switch. Rather than following the heralds sent into Troy to fetch him, the narrative switches audience alignment to Iris, the gods' messenger (and now, for the second time, a scene-changing device) and follows her, disguised as Helen's sister-in-law Laodike, to Helen's bedroom (3.121–4). This is a startling juxtaposition of space, jumping quite literally from the battlefield to the bedroom.³⁴ This switch to Helen also allows for two important recaps. First, the robe Helen weaves sums up the whole of the Trojan conflict (3.125–8), and so introduces her character explicitly through her role in that conflict, which adds her shared backstory to those of Paris and Menelaos that previous beats pointed to (cf. 3.46–53, 3.99f., etc.). Then Iris's speech recaps the last beat, and the agreement reached between Menelaos and Hektor (3.130–7 recaps 3.86–110): this allows for Helen's response to Paris's proposal in addition to those we have seen of Hektor, Menelaos, and the Trojan and Achaian people. Helen longs for her former husband (3.139f.) and this access to her emotion creates character alignment with her, just as the narrative keeps the audience attached to her as she goes to the walls of Troy.

On the wall, the narrative switches the audience's alignment again, to the Trojan elders, whom the narrative introduces (3.146–9). These men see Helen approaching, and they, too, repeat her role in starting the war (3.146–9). Helen herself re-introduces the main Achaian characters, reiterating their names and roles in her exchange with Priam (Agamemnon, Odysseus, Aias, Idomeneus, 3.167–242). This short scene in Troy can bring any audience member up to speed, and can reinforce again (twenty minutes after the catalogues in terms of performance) the epic's main characters and their roles and relationships as the narrative moves forward.

This beat also elaborates on the exchange between Hektor and Paris, shedding new light on what we have just seen of Hektor's character through other character perspectives. The Trojan elders at the gate echo Hektor's frustration with the Trojans for not making Paris's death happen (3.56f.), as they say 'there can be no anger at the Trojans and the well-greaved Achaians for suffering long pain for the sake of this woman' (οὐ νέμεσις Τρῳάσ καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦσ/ τοιῆδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν, 3.156f.). That the Trojans mention their 'anger' means that they have it, even if Helen's appearance assuages it. This confirms both Hektor's frustration with Paris *and* his frustration with the Trojans for not having punished Paris, but adds a new, complicating, dimension that Hektor had not focused on: Helen. The Trojan elders' view of Helen excuses their frustrations with the war. Helen herself also 'answers' Hektor's rebuke for Paris when she echoes Hektor's wish that Paris had died before marrying Helen, wishing that she had wanted to die when she left her first husband, and her people to come to Troy with Paris (3.173–6; cf. 3.40–2). So the viewpoints of the Trojan elders and Helen herself better situate Hektor's rebuke for Paris, confirming his frustrations while also showing us that the situation is slightly more emotionally complicated than Hektor had suggested.

At the same time, Priam's backstory of the embassy of Menelaos and Odysseus to his home creates a shared history between these characters, giving them each individually more depth, particularly in Priam's extensive descriptions of both men (3.205–24). The scene ends when Helen sees all of the Achaians she once knew except for her two brothers, whom she imagines might not have come to Troy, or might not have come to the battlefield, too ashamed to fight because of her (3.234–42). The narrator then comments that her brothers are dead, opening a gap between her knowledge and the audience's that creates a sense of *pathos* for Helen moving forward, and anticipation for when she might find out.³⁵ This exemplifies the use of 'melodramatic' tension between narrator and character knowledge to generate *pathos*. More, it adds the real threat of death to the following scenes, where we rejoin the Trojans and Achaians on the battlefield, with Paris and Menelaos preparing to do battle.

Now the beat switches to find the heralds again, moving through Troy and gathering things for the oath, which creates the illusion of continuity from their being dispatched (3.245–8; cf. 3.116f.). Before the heralds' encounter with Priam, the narrative has made time for the audience to build allegiance with the old man, and with Helen. The heralds recap the agreement between Hektor and Menelaos once again (3.256–8 recaps 3.73–5), giving us yet character response to the event, exploiting the narrative's melodramatic alignment structure. Priam shudders as they describe the truce (ρίγησεν, 3.259),³⁶ and with this access to his

response, the emotional stakes of the single combat increase, even if the audience ‘knows’ that neither Menelaos nor Paris can die yet, not in this story.

Trusted oaths (untrustworthy sons): 3.261–302

The narrative keeps the audience attached to the heralds when they bring Priam to the battlefield (3.261–6), as Menelaos had asked (3.105–10). Agamemnon himself lays out the oath, which repeats the terms of the single combat that Paris and Hektor had suggested (3.276–87 recaps 3.69–75 and 3.88–94). Agamemnon then builds further anticipation for the duel’s outcome, pushing past the simple ‘winner takes all’ scenario suggested in the earlier beats’ ‘terms’, and imagining instead a scenario where ‘Priam and the children of Priam’ refuse to give Helen back even if Menelaos does win (Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες, 3.288, cf. 3.106): if this happens, Agamemnon swears, he will stay and fight until the bitter end (3.288–91). So Agamemnon opens up a new possible series of outcomes for the single combat, one that will in fact happen: Paris will lose, the Trojans will not return Helen, Agamemnon will sack Troy. And in linking Priam with both his sons, Agamemnon obliquely implicates Hektor in that outcome.

As the narrator switches alignment away from Agamemnon, that outcome comes into sharper focus in ‘any man’s’ prayer to Zeus on the oath:³⁷ ‘whoever violates these oaths first, let their brains pour to the ground like this wine, theirs and their children’s, and let their wives be raped by others’ (ὀπότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια πημήνειαν/ ὠδέ σφ’ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέει ὡς ὄδε οἶνος/ αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ’ ἄλλοισι δαμείεν. 3.299–301). This creates consequences for actions that have not yet happened, but that will happen. A traditional audience who knows how the story ends will see this as an explanation for all that comes after, but then the narrative confuses expectations slightly. When the oath concludes, the narrator simply says, ‘they spoke, and the son of Kronos would not make these things happen for them’ (ὡς ἔφαν, οὐδ’ ἄρα πῶ σφιν ἐπεκράαινε Κρονίων, 3.302).

Duel: 3.303–448

Once the oath is sworn, the narrative switches alignment to Priam. Just as he shuddered when he first heard of the combat (3.259), now he leaves the battlefield because he ‘cannot bear to see with his eyes his dear son fighting against war-loving Menelaos’ (ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶ τλήσομ’ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὄρασθαι/ μαρνάμενον

φίλον υἷὸν ἀρηϊφίλω Μενελάω, 3.306f.). That Priam cannot watch the fight builds anticipation for it all the more, and creates concern for Paris in the fight that might not exist otherwise for the audience, based on what they have seen and heard of him so far.

Hektor and Odysseus measure out the combat area and draw lots to determine who has the first spear-cast (3.314–25). The narrative explicitly says that Hektor shakes out Paris's lot, 'looking backwards' (ἄψ ὀρόων, 3.325), seemingly painting Hektor as trustworthy, despite the concerns of Agamemnon and Menelaos. The arming sequences follow and spend eight lines detailing Paris's armour (3.330–8), but only a single line saying that Menelaos 'also armed' (3.339).³⁸ This greater narrative investment in Paris just before the battle corresponds to the greater number of beats associated with Paris that have occurred so far in this episode: the conversation between Hektor and Paris, the time spent in Troy, and Priam's emotional responses to the duel. Throughout, the narrative has kept the audience more aligned with the Trojan side. But Menelaos prays before his spear-cast, his prayer to Zeus a reminder that Paris has done him wrong and broken the conventions of guest-friendship (3.351–4). With this build-up, the narrative masterfully creates a scenario where an audience member can invest allegiance in either side: with Paris, because the audience 'knows' him better, or with Menelaos, because he is in the right.

Paris fights badly; Aphrodite rescues him, commands Helen to sleep with him, and leaves Paris and Helen together to have sex (3.346–447). As Helen comes into their bedroom, she tells Paris that he should challenge Menelaos again (3.432f.); Paris's response cavalierly admits defeat at Menelaos's hands with Athena's help (νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, 3.439), but he makes no mention of returning Helen because he has lost (3.438–46). Melodrama comes into play again, as Paris wilfully ignores the significance of this single combat with Menelaos, claiming that he might win against him another time (κεῖνον δ' αὐτίς ἐγώ, 3.440). He forgets the oath. He forgets that, if he has lost, and he does not return Helen, he will be an oath-breaker. Audience allegiance to him here depends on audience attention and commitment to the world: do they remember the consequences of the oath? Do they judge Paris according to that oath? Does this beat confirm Hektor's earlier assertions about Paris (3.39–57)? Or Menelaos's (3.106)?

Missing in action: 3.448–61

The scene suddenly changes from Paris's bedroom (literally his *bed*) to Menelaos searching for Paris on the battlefield on the same line (3.448; cf. 3.121), creating

a sharp juxtaposition between the two men and the two spaces that they simultaneously occupy.³⁹ Then the narrative switches audience alignment to the Trojans, who could not give Paris up, explaining that they would not have hidden him out of friendship, because they hated him like black death (οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότητί γ' ἐκεύθανον εἴ τις ἴδοιτο/ ἴσον γὰρ σφιν πᾶσιν ἀπήχθετο κηρὶ μελαίνῃ, 3.453f.). This calls back to Hektor's rebuke at the beginning of the episode that suggested the Trojans should have long ago stoned Paris for his crimes (3.56f.). The episode ends with Agamemnon declaring victory for Menelaos, demanding the return of Helen (3.457–60), which recaps again the terms of the oath the previous scenes established (3.276–91). This resolves the 'problem' of this possible episode as it provides an outcome in the confrontation between Paris and Menelaos. But it also looks forwards, building the expectation that the oath's terms will be respected: even if any audience member will guess that peace will not happen (based on tradition or the fact that the story has only been going for about two and half hours), the ambiguity of what will happen next demands further audience engagement.

This 'episode', then, stretching, as it might, from Iris's first trip to the Trojan assembly as 'Polites', all the way through to leaving these Trojans searching for Paris on the battlefield, builds allegiance with the Trojans (2.786-3.461). But, at the same time, a complex series of interactions challenges those allegiances. Does an audience support Hektor, because he is right, compared to Paris? Or do they support the Achaians against them both?

Gods: 4.1–72

Just as Agamemnon's declaring victory for Menelaos resolved the last 'episode', the beginning of Book 4 provides enough diegetic retelling of the major events in the last 'episode' to make the division between Books 3 and 4 a plausible performance break.⁴⁰ Book 4 starts with an abrupt scene switch from the Trojan battlefield to the gods on Olympos. Here the narrative aligns the audience with Zeus, giving us access to his motivations, as he wants to goad Hera. His taunting speech to her recaps significant events of the last 'episode', including Aphrodite's saving Paris (4.10–12 recaps 3.380–2), and Menelaos's victory (4.13; recaps 3.457). Zeus then asks the other gods whether or not they should start the war up again or allow the return of Helen and the salvation of Troy (4.14–9): this sets up two possibilities for how the narrative will play out, and even a traditional audience's knowing that the truce must break would raise curiosity as to *how*.

The exchange that follows lets Zeus elaborate on Hera's and his own histories with and subsequent feelings for the Trojans (4.31–49). These backstories create a sense of depth in the characters: Zeus's feelings are based on the fact that he has a past where the Trojans always honoured him (4.48f.). Zeus vividly describes Hera's hate (4.30–6), but does not explain it: a traditional audience would know that her hatred remains from the Judgement of Paris,⁴¹ but others would be left to wonder about her motives, and that ambiguity would create further engagement. Despite his own feelings towards the Trojans, Zeus gives in to Hera, who directs him to send Athena to the army to ensure that the Trojans break their oaths first (4.64–7); Zeus repeats these orders to Athena just a moment later (4.25–72). This phrasing recalls the terms for 'the first to break the oaths' at 3.298–301, pointing towards the long-term consequences that might be in store for the Trojans, while Athena's 'mission' itself sets the agenda for the following beat.

Broken oaths: 4.73–220

The audience stays attached to Athena as she moves from the gods' council to Pandaros, whom she, disguised as Laodokos, convinces to let loose an arrow against Menelaos. She implies that Paris would be happy to see Menelaos's corpse (4.93–103), and this is convincing because of the shared history of the two men that the narrative has now shown some glimpses of (cf. 3.67–75). The narrative stretches out Pandaros's taking up the bow and finally making his shot, taking almost two full minutes to describe the process, building suspense by seeming to slow down time (4.105–26).⁴² As the arrow is in the air, the narrative switches alignment to Menelaos through its apostrophe:⁴³ the narrator tells *Menelaos* what happens to the arrow as Athena brushes it aside (4.127–9).⁴⁴ Just as with Pandaros's shooting the arrow, Menelaos's wound attracts several lines of narrative investment. First, the narrator describes the arrow strike itself (4.134–40), before moving onto the wound through an extended simile and another apostrophe to Menelaos (4.141–7).

Then the narrative switches the audience's alignment suddenly to Agamemnon, who shudders when he sees Menelaos's wound (ρίγησεν, 4.149f.; cf. Priam's 'shudder' at 3.259). Agamemnon's response to Menelaos's wound allows for another recap of the previous 'episode's' events, through from quite a different perspective than that of the gods, and in obviously different circumstances. Agamemnon mentions the oaths sworn (4.157 recaps 3.264–301); the single

combat (4.156 recaps 4.340–80); the details of the oath (4.158f recaps 4.268–96); and finally the penalty for breaking the oath. When the oath was sworn, they prayed: ‘Let their brains pour out on the ground like this wine, and that of their sons, and let their wives be raped by others.’ (ὠδέ σφ’ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέει ὡς ὄδε οἶνος/ αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ’ ἄλλοισι δαμεῖεν. 3.300f.)⁴⁵ Now, with the truce broken, Agamemnon says: ‘The Olympian . . . will make it happen, and they’ll pay a great price, with their own heads, and with their women, and with their children.’ (ἔκ τε καὶ ὄψ’ ἐτελεί, σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν/ σύν σφῆσιν κεφαλῆσι γυναιξὶ τε καὶ τεκέεσσιν, 4.161f.) So it follows that Agamemnon then predicts the fall of Troy (4.164–8), even if he goes on to fret that he might fail in this Trojan expedition, should Menelaos die (4.169–82). This whole beat seemingly has nothing to do with Hektor: he has been absent from the narrative for over twenty minutes of performance time (since 3.325), and he is nowhere to be seen now. However, Agamemnon’s speech raises the ante for the Trojan side as a whole, because the Trojan women and children (including Hektor’s wife and child) will be destroyed as a matter of divine justice. Menelaos is quick to assure Agamemnon that the wound is not fatal, and soon Machaon the healer makes his way onto the battlefield to help Menelaos (4.183–219).

Ready to rumble: 4.220–421

While Menelaos is being tended to, the narrator switches our alignment to the advancing Trojans (4.220–2): we have not seen anything of the Trojans as a whole since they were all searching for Paris on the battlefield around twenty minutes earlier, not counting any break in the performance (3.451–4). This Trojan attack coming so close after Agamemnon’s damning them as oath-breakers gives no clue to *their* reaction to Pandaros’s shooting Menelaos. So the narrator keeps its audience aligned with the Achaians as they continue to recap and reinforce the Trojans’ position as oath-breakers and they prepare for battle.

The Achaians arm and Agamemnon jumps into action (4.222–5). To the men he finds eager, Agamemnon recaps again the Trojans’ broken oaths and their consequences:

‘Father Zeus will be no help to liars: these men were the first to break the oaths and the vultures will feast on their delicate skin and we’ll lead their dear wives and innocent children away in our ships when we’ve sacked the city.’ (οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι πατήρ Ζεὺς ἔσσειτ’ ἀρωγός,/ ἀλλ’ οἱ περ πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια

δηλήσαντο/ τῶν ἦτοι αὐτῶν τέρενα χροά γῦπες ἔδονται,/ ἡμεῖς αὐτ' ἀλόχους τε
φίλας καὶ νήπια τέκνα/ ἄξομεν ἐν νήεσσιν, ἐπὴν πτολιέθρον ἔλωμεν. 4.235–9).

To the men who are hanging back, Agamemnon asks if they are waiting for the Trojans to come close to their ships, and so suggests the first possibility that the Trojans might reach the Achaian ships (4.247–9). Agamemnon then goes from commander to commander, so that the narrative introduces the primary Achaians once again: Idomeneus (4.257–64), the Aiantes (4.273–91), Nestor (with Pelagon, Alastor, Chromios, and Haimon, 4.293–325), Menestheus (4.327f.), Odysseus (4.329–63), and finally, Diomedes and Sthenelos (4.365–422). Their introduction being last points towards Diomedes' central role in the battle to come.

This exchange between Agamemnon and Idomeneus recaps that the Trojans have broken their oaths (4.269f.), and that they will have death and sorrow for being the first to break the oaths (4.270f.; 4.271 = 4.236 = 4.72 = 4.67). Each of the exchanges between Agamemnon and the other leaders also works to establish or reinforce the world's values with which the audience can judge the epic's characters in the battle context: they give us a framework for our allegiance moving forward. At the same time, we can assume that these Achaian leaders will be playing key roles in the battle to come, creating anticipation for each of their fates before the battle begins. Agamemnon's exchanges also work to build backstories and to deepen these characters and their relationships. So looking backwards through the past few 'episodes', those that Books 1 and most of 2 encompass focused on the Achaians, while those in the end of Book 2 and most of Book 3 focused on the Trojans; now the Achaians are re-introduced here. These necessary episodes have built up audience allegiances with a range of Trojan and Achaian characters, so that the audience is emotionally invested in the battle when it finally comes. This is why the *Iliad* starts *in medium res*, rather than in the middle of battle.

Now the audience knows many of the main warriors involved, and many of their values, as they watch the battle unfold. Audience members will have found allegiance with heroes on both sides, and the battle itself provides a context that continues to add narrative layers to these characters that will affect those allegiances. This kind of diverse character investment is common to serial narratives. In *Game of Thrones*' 'Battle of the Blackwater' (Season 2, Episode 9), the whole episode focuses on Stannis Baratheon's attack on King's Landing. Because of the multiplicity of characters and perspectives that the show has built up to this point, an audience can have a variety of conflicted allegiances during the battle. The audience might hate Joffrey Lannister, but root for his uncle, Tyrion; might have ambivalence towards Cersei Lannister, but worry for the

women in the citadel and what will happen should the city fall; might not *like* Stannis Baratheon, but might think he has a legitimate claim on the crown; might root for Stannis's honest and low-born 'Onion Knight', Davos Seaworth, regardless of how they think of Stannis himself. These multiple investments keep the audience engaged in every beat, in the interconnected fates of the many characters as the battle progresses.

Battle: 4.422–543

The scene changes as the narrative gives us a description of the two armies coming against one another: the Achaians like silent, beating waves (4.422–32), the Trojans like sheep waiting to be milked, bleating for their lambs (4.433–6). This parenting simile for the Trojans raises an ominous feeling, after the sequential warnings about the consequences of their oath-breaking for their children.⁴⁶ Then the narrative zooms out and shows Ares driving on the Trojans, Athena driving on the Achaians (4.439), and Terror and Fear and Hate driving on them all (4.440–5).

From the general description of the fray, the narrative zooms back in on individual combat encounters. Now, many of the Achaians whom the narrative has already introduced get their first kills, while others appear for the first time. The narrator brings in Antilochos in his first appearance,⁴⁷ as he kills Echepolos (4.457–62). The Trojan Agenor kills Elephenor (4.463–70) and both the Trojans and the Achaians fight over the body; Telamonian Aias kills Simoeisios (4.473–89); Priam's son Antiphos tries to get Aias with his spear, but hits Odysseus's companion Leukos instead (4.489–93); Odysseus responds with anger to Leukos's death, and kills Priam's bastard son Demokoön (4.494–504).⁴⁸ With this last kill, the advantage shifts towards the Achaians. Now the audience gets a fleeting glimpse of Hektor for the first time in nearly forty-five minutes of performance time: 'then the vanguard retreated, and shining Hektor' (χώρησαν δ' ὑπό τε πρόμαχοι καὶ φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ, 4.505). The narrative names Hektor and reinforces his role as the Trojan battlefield leader, but now, he is leading his men in the wrong direction.

The narrative switches the audience's alignment to Apollo, who exhorts the fleeing Trojans (4.507–13). Apollo announces to them that Achilles is missing from the battlefield (4.512f.), recalling Achilles' withdrawal after his quarrel with Agamemnon from the epic's first episode. Then Athena stirs up the Achaians (4.514–6). When battle starts again, the narrative continues to switch audience

alignment back and forth between the Achaians and the Trojans: Diores dies at the hands of Thoas (4.517–26), who in turn dies at the hands of Peiros (4.527–35), and finally, ‘on that day, many of the Trojans and the Achaians lay stretched out in the dust beside one another’ (πολλοὶ γὰρ Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἤματι κείνῳ/ πρηνέες ἐν κονίησι παρ’ ἀλλήλοισι τέταντο. 4.543f.). This line consciously acknowledges the audience’s diverse allegiances: whoever’s side you are on, your side has lost someone, is losing someone. While a performer certainly might end his ‘episode’ here, on this image, there is no resolution, no real break in the battle.

Overhaul: 5.1–453

The narrative hones in on Diomedes in the battle at the beginning of Book 5, as Athena spurs him into battle.⁴⁹ Diomedes’ exchange with Sthenelos and Agamemnon lasted around four minutes (4.365–418), and would have taken place less than ten minutes ago if the action of Books 4 and 5 is continuous. This was the first time that the audience saw Diomedes speak, and yet here, under Athena’s influence, he undergoes what Mittell calls a ‘character overhaul.’⁵⁰ Diomedes’ overhaul in his *aristeia*, or time of battlefield excellence, will affect both audience and other characters’ recognition of the hero in the scenes to come. This significantly expands audience understanding for the possibilities of character in this storyworld (Hektor himself will undergo a similar transformation). At the same time, it creates a new dynamism between character and context, between the warrior and battle, as we see how battle can change our heroes.

After Diomedes’ *aristeia* begins, he is not the first to get a kill on the battlefield. Instead, a series of Achaians have successful kills first: Agamemnon kills Odios (5.38–42); Idomeneus kills Phaistos (5.53–7); Menelaos kills Skamandrios (5.49–58); Meriones kills Phereklos, the builder of Paris’s ships (5.59–68); Meges kills Pedaios (5.69–75); Eurypylos kills Hypsenor (5.76–83). This string of ‘recognizable’ heroes sets up a clear contrast with Diomedes, about whom the narrator tells the audience: ‘But you wouldn’t have even known *who* Tydeus’s son was fighting for – the Trojans or the Achaians’ (Τυδεΐδην δ’ οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη/ ἢ ἐ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὀμίλῃοι ἢ μετ’ Ἀχαιοῖς, 5.85f.). The narrator challenges the audience to re-recognise Diomedes under Athena’s divine influence.

The next beat follows Pandaros’s gaze,⁵¹ as he watches Diomedes, aims his arrow, hits him and boasts (5.95–105). But Sthenelos pulls the arrow out and Athena heals Diomedes (5.106–22) before sending him back into battle with the

ability to recognise gods and three times more rage than he had before (5.123–43). So the narrative reinforces Diomedes' character overhaul, giving him even more supernatural powers. With his new rage, Diomedes kills eight men in quick succession (5.144–65), and the beat switches again, this time following Aineias's gaze, who watches Diomedes from across the battlefield.

This beat switch could indicate a break in performance, as Aineias's failure to recognise Diomedes presents ample opportunity for the narrative and other characters to recap his name and role. The fact that Aineias approaches Pandaros further suggests that a performer might take a break here, as the re-introduction of Pandaros will also allow for continuity from the previous 'episode', and for Pandaros's diegetic retelling of his shooting Menelaos.

Aineias approaches Pandaros to ask where his arrows and his fame have gone, repeating Pandaros's name and role (5.171–3), before asking if the archer can take a shot at 'whoever this is, ruling it and doing lots of bad things to the Trojans' (ὅς τις ὄδε κρατέει καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε/ Τρῶας, 5.175). So after Diomedes' character overhaul, Aineias also has trouble recognizing him. Aineias's exchange with Pandaros then allows Pandaros to re-identify Diomedes, give a recap of recent events, give his own backstory, and look forward to what will happen next. Pandaros identifies the 'unknown' warrior as Diomedes based on his physical characteristics (5.180–3) and he recaps his shooting Diomedes just a few minutes earlier (5.184–91 recaps 5.96–106): Pandaros then goes further back, recapping his shot at Menelaos (5.206–8 recaps 4.105–40), some forty-five minutes earlier in performance time. Finally Pandaros talks about his departure from home, his desire to win glory for Hektor (5.211), and his self-curse that someone should kill him should he not break his bow if he wins home and sees his wife again (5.212–7). This reinforces Pandaros's role in the battle, reiterates Hektor as the Trojan leader (worth winning glory for), and finally, causes the audience to wonder as to whether or not Pandaros will make it home to his wife.⁵² The audience's knowledge of the consequences for breaking the oath that Pandaros has broken places him on a precarious edge (3.298–301; cf. 4.157–68; 4.266–71).

Diomedes brutally kills Pandaros just a few moments after his homecoming fantasy, at 5.290. The narrative has built to this over several episodes, starting with the catalogues; first we meet the Achaians, then the Trojans, with the embedded violent threat to the Trojan wives and children in the oath sworn for single combat; then the Trojans breaking the oath, and the first battle deaths. Now the narrative shows a recognizable Trojan, Pandaros, who broke the oath, suffer a death that could be the result of his oath-breaking, and we know that his death will have a knock-on effect with his wife at home (cf. 5.212–7).

Aineias jumps into action to protect the fallen Pandaros, but Diomedes throws a rock at him, shatters his hip, and he has to be rescued by Aphrodite (5.312–8); Diomedes stabs Aphrodite herself (5.334–51), and then tries again for Aineias just a short time later, and finally confronts Apollo himself before stopping (5.433–43), while Aineias lands in Pergamum, replaced on the battlefield with a phantom (5.444–53). This prompts Apollo to ask Ares for help in fighting Diomedes (5.454–9), which in turn prompts Ares to disguise himself as Akamas to exhort the Trojans (5.461–70).

Returns: 5.454–532

This sequence of events brings Hektor back into the narrative. First Ares/Akamas urges the Trojans to fight because ‘a man is down whom we honoured the same as brilliant Hektor – Aineias, son of big-hearted Anchises’ (κεῖται ἀνὴρ ὄν ἴσον ἐτίομεν Ἐκτορι δίῳ/ Αἰνεΐας υἱὸς μεγαλήτορος Ἀγχίσοιο, 5.467f.), recapping and reframing Aineias’s injury (5.305–10). This rhetoric works to stir up the men (5.470), while it reinforces Hektor’s role again at the top of the Trojan hierarchy despite his absence from battle. Sarpedon responds by ‘really insulting brilliant Hektor’ (μᾶλα νείκεσεν Ἐκτορα δίον, 5.471): this line conjures Hektor for the audience before Sarpedon addresses him in the next line.

Sarpedon’s insult uses backstory to give us new information about Hektor, Sarpedon, and their relationship. But first, he asks where Hektor’s erstwhile *menos* (battle-fury) has gone (Ἐκτορ πῆ δὴ τοι μένος οἴχεται ὃ πρὶν ἔχεσκες; 5.472), and his brothers and brothers-in-law that he had boasted he could defend the city with, alone – Sarpedon cannot see them (5.473–6). Sarpedon implies his own past experience with Hektor, saying that Hektor always used to have *menos*. But the narrative goes beyond just giving more character information through a subjectively framed backstory. In the *X-Files* (FOX, 1993–2002), David Duchovny, who played one of the two leads, Fox Mulder, left the show for most of its eighth and ninth seasons. In the series finale, Mulder re-appears, and Scully, his partner, simply asks him, ‘God, where have you been? Where have you been hiding?’ While the *Iliad*’s poet did not have to worry about an embodied actor wanting to leave the show, he uses a similar narrative ‘wink’ at the audience to re-introduce a major character that has been missing from the narrative. Hektor’s *menos* – Hektor himself, has been missing from the battlefield for over forty-five minutes. And Sarpedon’s reference to Hektor’s missing ‘brothers and brothers-in-law’ draws attention to Paris’s persistent absence since 3.380–2, well over an hour ago. The rest of Sarpedon’s speech gives us

more character information, as he draws a contrast between his own responsibilities on the battlefield, as an ally from far-off Lykia, and those of Hektor, reiterating their respective roles. Just as Pandaros did (5.212f.), Sarpedon invites further audience allegiance as he elaborates his role to Hektor as a father and husband, saying that ‘he has left behind his beloved wife and young son there’ (ἐνθ’ ἄλοχόν τε φίλην ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον υἷόν, 5.480). Sarpedon then draws attention to Hektor’s failure in his role, while Hektor is defending his own home, ‘he doesn’t even order the other men to stay and defend their wives’ (ἀτὰρ οὐδ’ ἄλλοισι κελεύεις/ λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὄρεσσι, 5.485f.). The concern for women and children has come onto the battlefield in dribs and drabs over the last few beats;⁵³ now Sarpedon projects a motivation onto Hektor that he should have, indirectly accusing him of failing *his* wife and child, behind the walls of Troy. Sarpedon ends with a warning about the fall of Troy, admonishing the Trojans not to fall prey to their enemies and let their city be sacked (5.491f.). This scene, coming close on the heels of Pandaros’s death, and Aineias’s near-death, focuses the threat of death of ‘major’ characters closer to Hektor, and with it the consequences of such death: the vulnerability of women and children, the fall of Troy. The insult ‘bites’ into Hektor’s heart (δάκε δὲ φρένας Ἐκτορι μῦθος, 5.493), but he does not respond, except for jumping into battle to stir up his troops (5.494–6). And then, once again, he disappears.

Aineias conveniently returns after a very short zoom-out that takes in both armies (5.497–505), Apollo returning him from Pergamum. Aineias’s friends rejoice, but do not have time to ask him where he has been (5.512–6): this is another narrative wink, because the audience knows where he has been (5.445f.). In the *X-Files* scene above, Scully finally asks Mulder what he was doing and where he was. He says ‘I can’t tell you, Scully.’ She, frustrated, responds, ‘Mulder, that doesn’t make any sense.’ Mulder reassures her, ‘You’ve got to trust me, Scully. I know things. It’s better you don’t.’ The whole scene makes fun of the plot device of Mulder’s disappearance and reappearance, much as the *Iliad*’s narrative self-consciously draws attention to its own plot device of bringing Aineias back here. At the same time, Aineias’s return reinforces the previous beat’s discussion of consequences of battlefield absence by showing its obverse: the joy felt when a leader comes back to battle, unharmed. Aineias’s return also comes nearly as soon as Hektor has entered battle: this confuses audience expectations as to who the narrative will align the audience with more in the battle scenes to come. This confusion, in turn, builds anticipation to see what will happen next.

As Hektor once again steps aside, it is worth thinking about how the narrator works to compare his times of battlefield absence against those of the other heroes. The narrative switches our alignment back to the Achaian side, and now

re-introduces the Aiantes and Odysseus alongside Diomedes (5.519), seemingly balancing out the trio of primary Trojans and allies (Aineias, Sarpedon and Hektor) that the previous beats established as heading into battle. Agamemnon is here, too, stirring up the troops with an exhortation that focuses on cooperation as a means of survival (5.529–32). The narrator purposefully brings these characters back in after long absences to expand the battle away from its previous central focus of Diomedes (and, to a lesser extent, Aineias): this contextualizes Hektor's own absence from the battlefield while Aineias was the primary Trojan fighter, as the Aiantes, Odysseus, and Menelaos were all absent during Diomedes' *aristeia*. But the narrative only asks us to consider Hektor's absence as part of our allegiance to a character, and he is the only one of these characters to receive a rebuke upon his return.

Battle: 5.533–89

Now battle begins again, as the narrator rapidly switches alignment between the two sides. After Agamemnon's exhortation, he throws his spear and kills Deïkoön, a companion of Aineias (5.533–6). Aineias does not respond to this death, but the narrative does switch the audience's alignment to Aineias in the next beat, and this juxtaposition makes it seem as though Aineias's kills of Orsilochos and Krethon (5.541–9) respond to Deïkoön's death.⁵⁴ Their deaths give the narrator a chance to repeat the important past information that these two men sailed to Ilium to win honour for Agamemnon and Menelaos (5.550–3), referencing the beginning of the war and its cause.

The next beat then appropriately switches audience alignment to Menelaos, who pities the two fallen sons of Diokles (5.561–5).⁵⁵ Ares drives him into battle, thinking that Aineias might beat him down (5.562–4). Then the narrator aligns the audience with Antilochos, who sees what Menelaos is doing and runs to Menelaos's aid against Aineias (5.565–70), just as Menelaos and Aineias square off to face one another (5.568f.).⁵⁶ Aineias takes off upon seeing their double team, while Menelaos and Antilochos rescue the dead bodies (presumably of the sons of Diokles), and then kill Pylaimenes and Mydon, respectively (5.573–89).

Overhaul: 5.590–627

Now, as he sees Menelaos and Antilochos from across the battlefield, Hektor finally returns, almost ten minutes after Sarpedon's rebuke (5.472–92), and just

after Aineias has failed against them. Ares and Enyo accompany Hektor as he ranges through his ranks (5.590–5): this approximates Diomedes' own character overhaul from earlier in the episode, and it cause similar problems of recognition, for both the audience and for the other characters. We have not yet seen Hektor fight, so we could not see a change in Hektor's fighting if we tried. But Diomedes can. And, we might remember, the overhauled Diomedes can recognize the gods (5.127f.). So when Diomedes sees Hektor, he yells out to his men: 'Friends, we used to wonder at the kind of spearman Hektor was – a brave warrior – but now one of the gods defends him from ruin – Ares is with him, looking like a mortal.' (ὦ φίλοι οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἐκτορα δῖον/ αἰχμητὴν τ' ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέον πολεμιστήν/ τῷ δ' αἰεὶ πάρα εἷς γε θεῶν, ὃς λοιγὸν ἀμύνει/ καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κείνος Ἄρης βροτῷ ἀνδρὶ ἑοικώς, 5.601–5). Diomedes draws on his own past experience of Hektor as a great warrior to insist that Hektor is even better now. This confirms the implied-past Hektor that we have heard about before but never experienced for ourselves: the man-slaughterer (1.242), the one with great battle-fury (*menos*, cf. 5.472). Now, on top of this, Ares helps Hektor, and for the first time, Hektor kills – Anchialos and Menesthes (5.608–10). But the narrative quickly swerves away from Hektor again, following a gaze from the fallen Anchialos and Menesthes back to its subject, Aias, who kills Amphios out of pity for the two fallen men but is soon driven backwards again (5.610–26).

Sarpedon: 5.628–78

With Hektor once again pushed aside, the narrative jumps to Tlepolemos, Herakles' son, as he faces off against Sarpedon (5.628f.). Tlepolemos taunts Sarpedon, questioning their shared Zeus ancestry, before telling the story of Herakles, 'who sacked the city of Troy and widowed its streets' (Ἰλίου ἐξαλάπαξε πόλιν, χήρωσε δ' ἀγυιάς, 5.642). This reference to a past sack of Troy suggests the possibility of the future sack – particularly in its use of the verb 'widowed' playing on Sarpedon's accusing Hektor of failing to defend the Trojan wives (5.486). Tlepolemos then seemingly refers to Aias's kills in the previous beat, when he tells Sarpedon that he is a coward, and people are dying (σοὶ δὲ κακὸς μὲν θυμός, ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί, 5.643). Tlepolemos and Sarpedon finally throw their spears; Sarpedon kills Tlepolemos; Tlepolemos strikes Sarpedon through the thigh with his spear (5.655–62). Both men are dragged out of the fighting by their men, Sarpedon still with the spear through his thigh (5.663–9). Sarpedon falling means that another one of the Trojan-allied leaders will have to

come back into the foreground, building anticipation for Hektor to once again emerge.

But the narrative aligns the audience with the Achaians first. Like Aias, the narrator named Odysseus among the Achaians at 5.519, and now, seeing Tlepolemos fall, Odysseus considers whether or not he should go after Sarpedon. But Athena pushes him against the other Lykians, and he kills seven in quick succession: Koiranos, Chromios, Alastor, Halios, Alkandros, Prytanis and Noemon (5.677–9). This is the first time in the epic that someone kills people in a list:⁵⁷ it serves as a condensed burst of battlefield excellence (Diomedes' eight kills took from 5.144–65). And Odysseus would have killed even more, the narrator tells us, if it were not for Hektor.⁵⁸

Hektor: 5.679–710

The contrafactual that re-introduces Hektor gives the audience a greater allegiance with Hektor, knowing that Odysseus would have killed more if not for his intervention. As Hektor sees Odysseus, the narrator focuses on his appearance, as he 'strides out', mentioning his shining helmet twice in two lines:⁵⁹ he is first 'great, shiny-helmed Hektor' (μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ, 5.680), then 'he goes out through the frontlines, in his shining bronze helmet' (βῆ δὲ διὰ προμάχων κεκορυθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῷ, 5.681). Then in one line, the narrative shows us the emotional responses to Hektor from both sides: 'He bore terror to the Danaans, but Sarpedon, the son of Zeus, rejoiced at him advancing' (δείμα φέρων Δαναοῖσι· χάρη δ' ἄρα οἱ προσιόντι/ Σαρπηδῶν Διὸς υἱός, 5.682f.). These successive views give the audience a three-dimensional look at Hektor, where he becomes the focal point for the *Iliad's* imagination. The diversity of these views allows different possibilities for audience allegiance: Hektor as a shining hero, a terrifying enemy, a saviour, or all three at once.

Sarpedon's delighted gaze segues into his imploring Hektor to stop and help him, as he still cannot stand (5.5.684–8), creating continuity from Sarpedon's last appearance the beat before last (5.663–7). Sarpedon's speech again mentions his wife and child, whom he will not be able to delight through a safe homecoming should he die at Troy (εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νῆπιον υἱόν, 5.688): once again, the mention of home invites the audience to wonder whether or not Sarpedon will make it back there, building anticipation for his death that the traditional audience might already know will happen. In this, the narrative also gives us access to Sarpedon's motivations, relaying his desire to make it home,

because of his roles as father and husband (cf. 5.480), not insignificantly roles that Hektor also occupies.⁶⁰ And the narrative gives us some access to Hektor's motivations too, describing him, as he just rushes past Sarpedon, 'striving to push back and kill the Argives' (5.689f.).

This proves a complicated answer to Sarpedon's earlier rebuke to Hektor. Now Hektor fights hard, but so hard that he leaves a man down on the battlefield, the same thing that Ares/Akamas rebuked the Trojans for when Aineias was fallen on the field (5.464–9). But then Sarpedon's companions immediately drag him out of the *mêlée* (5.692–8), releasing Hektor from having to save him. This creates ambiguities in how we judge Hektor in this scene: does Sarpedon's safety excuse Hektor's neglect of him on the field? Does Hektor's offensive action against the Achaians outweigh his present defensive obligation to his ally Sarpedon? Hektor's silence does not help the audience in constructing their allegiance. He has not spoken in nearly two hours of performance time, without considering breaks (3.94). We see Hektor, we hear what others think of him and ask of him, but we do not hear him.

The beat changes audience alignment from Sarpedon's recovery to the Argives, who still do not retreat, though they move slowly backwards because of Ares and Hektor (5.699–702). A performer might take a break here before the narrator asks who Hektor kills, as he implicitly recaps the previous beat with the repetition of Hektor's and Ares' names (and Hektor's being the son of Priam, 5.704) and their onslaught against the Achaians. That the narrator has to ask for the number of Hektor's and Ares' seven kills (5.677–9) makes their kills here *seem* greater than Odysseus' seven kills less than two minutes earlier (5.6747–9). This might be a conscious moment of juxtaposition, bigging up Hektor (backed, as he is, by Ares) to contrast with Odysseus. But this difference would matter less after a break, where an extended narrative introduction to Hektor's rampage would help resituate the audience.

Silent type: 5.711–909

Whether or not there is a break before Hektor's and Ares' kill list, the narrative switches away from Hektor again almost immediately as it shifts scenes to the gods (5.711). Hera and Athena see Ares helping Hektor and decide to intervene (5.711–8); but this decision only mentions *Ares* and not Hektor (5.717). The rest of the book starts a new beat sequence that follows the gods' story arcs, straight into the middle of the clashing story arcs of the Trojan and Achaian heroes. In

this sequence, Hera and Athena arm (5.719–52), ask Zeus for permission to enter the fray (5.753–67), and a disguised Hera exhorts the Achaians (5.784–93, which recaps Achilles' absence at 5.788), while Athena helps Diomedes wound Ares, before all the gods return to Mt. Olympos. Athena's direct help of Diomedes echoes the beginning of the Book, which may or may not have been performed as a continuous action (5.793–867 calls back to 5.1–8; 5.121–32).⁶¹ So Book 5 ends and the narrative re-joins the battle without the gods in the first line of Book 6. As we have received Book 5, it stands as the longest book in the *Iliad*, at over nine hundred lines, or almost seventy minutes in performance length. There are few indications within its battle sequence of a preferred break in its action. If we view the book as a performance episode,⁶² the episode's central problem simply moves the plot sideways, as Athena, with Hera's support, supports Diomedes in pushing all the gods who are allied with the Trojans – Aphrodite, Apollo, and Ares – off the battlefield. These events matter in terms of elaborating character relationships, backstories, and shared experiences, but they do little to advance the epic's plot.

Throughout the battle, the narrative foregrounds Diomedes and several other main Achaians, including Agamemnon, the Aiantes, Menelaos, Antilochos, and Odysseus, while it also pushes Aineias and Sarpedon, and Hektor to a lesser extent, forward from the Trojan side. These investments in supporting characters allow for diverse audience allegiances, while they delay and continue to build anticipation for the inevitable confrontation between Achilles and Hektor that the first book establishes.

Hektor has appeared in about a minute of the last seventy-five minutes of action and has not spoken in over two hours of performance time, eschewing the early books' expectation that suggested Hektor would be *the* main Trojan on the battlefield. In terms of characterization, Hektor remains elusive. He exists silently, like a black hole at the intersection of several gazes. In this battle sequence, Sarpedon has said that Hektor has not backed up his boasts, and does not defend his people (5.471–92); Diomedes has, in the past, with the other Achaians, been amazed by Hektor as a warrior, but only fears him now because Ares backs him (5.596–606); the narrator sees him so bright and shiny in his helmet (5.680f.); the Danaans are terrified of him (5.682); Sarpedon is glad to see him but is ignored (5.682–91); the narrator must to ask how many Hektor killed (5.702–10); finally Hektor disappears when Diomedes and Athena drive Ares out of the battle (5.850ff.).

In Hektor's absences, the narrator has developed, through his other characters, a theme that will be very significant to Hektor moving forward: the connection

between warriors under threat on the battlefield and the consequences for their families and friends.⁶³ This is the case of Pandaros, who obliquely wonders if he will see his wife and home again (5.211–6), but then is brutally killed (5.290–6); Sarpedon who has left his wife and child behind to fight for Hektor (5.480); Aineias, whose return delights his friends (5.514–6); Sarpedon, who worries his death at Troy will not let him delight his wife and child (5.684–8). All of these moments form important internal narrative schemata that look past the warrior himself on the battlefield, into the social network that he is embedded in, with all the emotional consequences that that network implies.⁶⁴

Achaians kill: 6.1–36

The narrator cuts from Zeus and Ares at the end of Book 5 to the battlefield at the beginning of Book 6 with an explicit reference to the Trojans and the Achaians now being left alone to their fighting (οἰώθη, 6.1). This detail signals a shift away from the battle sequence of the gods fighting at the end of Book 5, which centred on divine intervention on the battlefield. While the sequences in Book 5 pushed Hektor to the sidelines for most of its action, Book 6 will foreground Hektor in over a half hour of performance time, over sixty per cent of its lines if it does constitute an episode. But, as in the first scenes of Book 5, the first scenes of Book 6 check in with many of the main Achaian characters.

First the narrator re-establishes the scenic space, shifting away from Mt. Olympus from the end of Book 5: now, as before, the Achaians and the Trojans are fighting in the space between the Xanthos and Simoeis (6.4; cf. 5.774).⁶⁵ Then we get a quick burst of battle that perfectly exploits the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure, in a beat sequence that catches up with many of the primary Achaian warriors for the first time since before the gods entered the fight, over twenty minutes ago, but that also throws some new faces into the mix. The work of the previous episodes have built up audience allegiance with some of these characters, and those characters become anchors on the Achaian side as we meet new characters, some of whom will become major players, some of whom will not. *Game of Thrones* uses a similar strategy to introduce new characters: think of the many characters thrown into the Battle of Hardhome. Many of these characters will never be seen again, but consider the giant, who appears throughout the battle with previously established characters like Jon Snow or Eddison Tollett, and then becomes a recurring character on the Wall.⁶⁶ We might similarly think of Alicia Florrick's chaotic first day in bond court on

The Good Wife, which introduces her to a slew of new characters, but only Lucca Quinn goes on to become a major character.⁶⁷ In this battle, first Telamonian Aias kills Akamas (6.5–11; cf. 5.617); Diomedes kills Axylos and Kalesios (6.12–9); Euryalos appears for the first time since the catalogue and kills Opheltios, Dresos, Aisepos, and Pedasos (6.20–8; cf. 2.565); Polypoites, too, pops up for his first time since the catalogue and kills Astyalos (6.29; cf. 2.740); Odysseus kills Pidytes (6.30; cf. 5.679); Teukros shows up for the first time and kills Aretaon (6.31); Antilochos kills Ableros (6.32f.; cf. 5.589); Agamemnon kills Elatos (6.33; cf. 5.537); Leïtos appears for the first time since the catalogue and kills Phylakos (6.35; cf. 2.494); Eurypylos kills Melanthios (6.36; cf. 5.79). Whether the narrator is introducing or re-introducing a key Achaian player here, the quick montage of kills clearly establishes that the Achaians are dominating on the battlefield: ten Achaians kill fourteen Trojans in less than three minutes.

Even the unborn: 6.37–72

But Menelaos interrupts their killing spree when he makes to capture Adrestos alive (6.37–51), only to be chided by Agamemnon, who tells him to remember the Trojans' crimes (6.55–60). As far as the Trojans go, Agamemnon says that 'not one of them will escape sudden destruction and our hands, not even the young boy that the mother still carries in her stomach, not even he will escape, but all of them together of Troy will be wiped out, uncared for, extinguished' (τῶν μὴ τις ὑπεκφύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον/ χεῖράς θ' ἡμετέρας, μηδ' ὄν τινα γαστέρι μῆτηρ/ κοῦρον ἔοντα φέροι, μηδ' ὄς φύγοι, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντες/ Ἰλίου ἔξαπολοῖατ' ἀκήδεστοι καὶ ἄφαντοι, 6.57–60). With these terrible words, Agamemnon elicits layers of audience memory: traditional memory for Paris's abduction of Helen; the prayers over the oath that the oath-breaker's brains and sons' brains will pour out like wine, their women to be raped by others (3.300f.); Pandaros breaking the oath and shooting Menelaos (4.124–40); Agamemnon's own previous declaration that Troy will fall (4.163–8). At the same time, it reminds us of the vulnerability of the Trojan women and children that Sarpedon pointed to in his rebuke for Hektor (5.485f.). So this short scene between Agamemnon, Menelaos, and Adrestos reinforces information from several earlier scenes, as does its brutal end, where Menelaos pushes the suppliant Adrestos away from him, Agamemnon stabs him with his spear (6.61–4), and, in a genius moment of ambiguity, 'Atreides' pulls it out once again (6.64): this 'son of Atreus' might well refer to either Agamemnon or Menelaos.

Nestor follows with an exhortation that clearly pushes forward this agenda of total war (6.67–71), as he urges his men not to bother with the spoils, saying instead, ‘let’s kill men’ (ἄνδρας κτείνωμεν, 6.70).

Mission: 6.73–118

The beat switches through a contrafactual to the terrified Trojans who would have retreated into Troy, had not Helenos approached Aineias and Hektor (6.73–6). The narrator introduces Helenos here for the first time in the epic, using his patronymic as Priam’s son to relate him to Hektor, by now so familiar to the audience as Priam’s son (Πριαμίδης, cf. 5.684). This scene’s position places it as a clear response to the Achaian violence of the previous beats, including the threat of violence to the Trojan women and children.⁶⁸ Helenos’s speech also functions in several ways in terms of the beat structure of serial narrative.

First, Helenos’s speech re-introduces Aineias and Hektor, reasserting their roles and names (6.77–9). Aineias was last seen at 5.572 (a half hour ago, without break time) and Hektor at 5.710 (twenty minutes ago, without break time). Helenos’s grouping them together now also recalls that these two were central characters in the previous ‘episode’: so it makes sense that Helenos addresses Aineias first, because he has been absent longer, but also because he served a more central role in the battle sequences leading up to the present scene.

After re-establishing Aineias and Hektor, Helenos then gives them each ‘missions’, which creates audience anticipation for the next several beats. First, he warns the leaders to put their men in order, to prevent them from running home and falling into the arms of their women (6.80–2). This might call back to Paris, who escaped to the arms of his woman all the way back at 3.382, around two hours ago.⁶⁹ Then, Helenos says that while they hold the line, Hektor will go back to Troy and ask the Trojan women to pray to Athena to have pity on the city and protect its women and children (6.86–95). Here Helenos links the actions on the battlefield and the direct consequences for those off of it to the current state of battle, playing on the trope that has developed in previous scenes. In his address to Hektor, Helenos also refers to their shared mother (6.87), so further embedding himself as a new character into the existing character network and emphasizing the proximity of his relationship to Hektor as full brothers.

Helenos’s mission for Hektor also plays on the narrative’s melodramatic alignment structure, playing on the gaps in knowledge that exist between the audience and certain characters. The audience will know that Athena has been

very actively helping the Trojans through the whole last battle sequence. This irony only grows as Helenos suggests that Athena's pity, 'on the city, and the Trojan women, and their young children' (αἶ κ' ἐλεήση/ ἄστυ τε καὶ Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα, 6.94), might motivate her to check Diomedes (ὡς κεν Τυδέος υἷον ἀπόσχη Ἰλίου ἱρής, 6.95). Of course, the audience knows that it was Athena who drove Diomedes through most of the last episode. So this recaps Diomedes' dominance in the previous episode, while creating considerable irony as Helenos's speech lays out the actions for the next few beats in Hektor's 'mission'.

Helenos also says that the Trojans now fear Diomedes even more than they 'feared Achilles . . . whom they say was born from a goddess' (οὐδ' Ἀχιλῆά ποθ' ὤδέ γ' ἐδειδμεν ὄρχαμον ἀνδρῶν, / ὅν πέρ φασι θεᾶς ἐξέμμεναι, 6.99f.). This mention of Achilles builds backstory (the Trojans have encountered Achilles in the past, and thought him the strongest warrior), speaks to Achilles' current absence (obliquely recapping Achilles' withdrawal from Book 1), and implicitly anticipates Achilles' eventual return. This last element becomes all the more important in that Helenos mentions Achilles *to* Hektor, again subtly building further anticipation for an eventual confrontation between the two men (cf. 1.240–4).

Helenos ends by saying that Diomedes has gone too mad, and that no one can match his battle-fury (ἀλλ' ὄδε λιγν/ μαίνεται, οὐδέ τις οἱ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν, 6.100f.). Diomedes was present in this episode's opening scenes and killed two men, but Helenos's assessment of him here recalls Diomedes' *aristeia* in the previous episode. Ending on such an emphatic danger in Diomedes gives Hektor's 'mission' to Troy more emotional urgency, and aids in audience alignment and allegiance with him for that mission.

The narrator keeps the audience attached to Hektor as he does what Helenos has asked, getting the troops in order, so that he 'wakes the dreadful battle din' in the Trojans (ἔγειρε δὲ φύλοπιν αἰνήν, 6.105). In response, the Achaians run away, stopping from their slaughter, 'thinking some immortal had come down from the starry heaven and defended the Trojans, they had twisted round so' (φᾶν δέ τιν' ἀθανάτων ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος/ Τρωσὶν ἀλεξήσοντα κατελθέμεν, ὡς ἐλέλιχθεν, 6.108f.). For a moment, the narrative elevates Hektor to a god, at least in the eyes of the Achaians. Here, the narrator plays on the established trope, where disguised gods rallied the Trojans (Iris as Polites at 2.790–806 and Ares as Akamas at 5.464–9); but also, again, implicitly links Hektor's battle success with the gods, as it was in his last battlefield appearance (5.703–20).

Then Hektor exhorts his men before running back to Troy, shaking two spears as he ranges their ranks (6.101–5). For the most part, Hektor repeats the

instructions that Helenos gave him (6.113–5; cf. 6.86–95). But he changes one key thing: rather than say that he will tell his mother to assemble the old women (6.87) to make the prayer to Athena, Hektor tells his men that he ‘will tell the elders and our wives’ to make the prayer (εἶπω βουλευτῆσι καὶ ἡμετέρης ἀλόχοισι, 6.114). This speech allows the audience a moment of access to Hektor. Perhaps Hektor’s thoughts turn to his own wife here, aware of the consequences for her that the previous scenes and episodes have laid out should he die on the battlefield; this certainly places his wife in the narrative frame for the audience.

This beat ends with Hektor running back to Troy, while the narrator uses his epithet κορυθαίολος (‘shiny-helmed’), he focuses most on his shield, which hits Hektor’s ankles and his neck as he runs back to Troy (6.117–9); these external markers reinforcing his role as Troy’s defender.

Face-off: 6.119–236

The beat that follows cuts away from Hektor and brings Diomedes back into action (fulfilling the audience expectation that Helenos established with his focus on Diomedes at 6.96–101), coming up against Glaukos.⁷⁰ This beat extends the audience’s break from battle, and even affords them a glimpse at peace, as Diomedes and Glaukos discover that they are ancestral guest-friends. On the other hand, the scene ends with Diomedes declaring that there are plenty of Trojans for him to kill, creating anticipation for further carnage for the Trojans, while Glaukos may only kill ‘if he is able’ (ὄν κε δύνῃαι, 6.229). Just as their armour exchange is near-comically uneven,⁷¹ the encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes suggests peace, but reinforces an inequality between the sides that does not bode well for the Trojans and their allies. This beat sequence gives the narrative a chance to stretch, engaging with traditional material in a way that might appeal to certain audience members. At the same time, it adds further depth to Diomedes’ character and establishes Glaukos as a recurring character, while its length builds greater anticipation for Hektor’s time in Troy.⁷²

Troy-time: 6.237–85

The beat switches away from the battlefield to Hektor’s arrival at Troy, on his ‘mission’ to get the Trojan women to pray to Athena. This marks the beginning of one of the epic’s longest ‘character-centric’ beat sequences. Apart from two

short beats, when the narrative is in Troy, it keeps the audience attached to Hektor.⁷³ This attachment – this time spent with him – provides ample opportunity for the audience to hone their allegiance to him, as his spoken exchanges with many other characters finally allow audience a broader access to his feelings and motivations that they can evaluate. In short, the amount and type of time spent with him compels us to feel something about his character, and maybe even feel something *for* his character.

Hektor's first encounter in Troy is with the Trojan women, who ask after their men (6.239f.); this follows ominously close on Diomedes' claim that there are plenty of Trojans to kill (6.227f.), while also looking forward to Hektor's encounter with his own wife.⁷⁴ Hektor tells the women to pray to the gods 'in turn' (ἐξείης, 6.241). This small word implies time taken with each woman, a carefulness and attentiveness on the part of Hektor. But the comment that there would be sorrow for many (πολλῆσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήπτο, 6.421), slightly ambiguous as to whether it comes from Hektor or the narrator, also speaks to the futility of the women's prayers, and gives further confirmation that this mission to the gods might be for naught.

Mission continued (Hekabe): 6.242–85

The narrative keeps the audience attached to Hektor as it follows him through Priam's palace,⁷⁵ past the bedrooms of Priam's sons and daughters, sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, embedding him in a social domestic space that further defines his character through these relationships. Here, the narrative introduces Hektor's mother (6.251) and his sister Laodike (6.251). Hekabe, still unnamed, speaks to Hektor: her speech reasserts his relation as her child τέκνον, 6.254). She asks him why he has left the battlefield, thinking that the Achaians might have worn him out (6.255f.; τείρουσι at 6.255) and suggesting that he has returned to Troy to give prayers to Zeus (6.256–60); finally, she offers him wine to restore his battle-fury (6.258–62; μένος at 6.251).⁷⁶ Hektor corrects her on nearly all these points, but she is not far off: the Trojans *have* been tired out; Helenos said that the Trojans were 'tired out' (τερόμενοί, 6.85) when he gave his orders to Hektor on the battlefield. Hekabe's assumption that Hektor has come back to pray is also close to the truth; Hektor has come back to ask the women to pray. Hekabe's assumptions come into tension with what we know of Hektor's mission. They also create a realistic sense of relationship between the two, as Hekabe projects motivations on Hektor based on her past experiences of her

son, giving the audience a sense of a shared backstory between them. She *knows* that he can be worn out, but she also knows that he has the good sense to pray to Zeus when he has been worn out, and that he has great *menos* (μένος μέγα, 6.261; cf. Sarpedon of Hektor at 5.472), and defends his neighbours (ἀμύνων σοῖσιν ἔτησι, 6.262). The strength of her character-based assumptions allows us to see Hektor, in his character and in his role, through Hekabe's eyes.

Hektor's response (his first spoken response in the epic) reiterates Hekabe's relationship to him, as he addresses her as 'lady mother' (πότνια μήτηρ, 6.264). He turns down her offer of wine, thinking it might diminish, rather than increase, his battle-fury and his courage (6.264f.).⁷⁷ And he denies any prayer to Zeus, as he is still spattered in battle-filth (6.265–8): here, he gives us some clue of his appearance, with its implications that he has been *killing* men (cf. 5.703–10). He reinforces this impression of his piety, especially towards Zeus (cf. 6.257f.; 4.44–9). Then Hektor recaps Helenos's orders to Hekabe (6.269–80 recaps 6.87–97). But Hektor then moves the plot forward in an unexpected direction by proposing an additional mission; to go find Paris and see if will listen to him and return to battle (6.280–5). The narrative has made no mention of Paris since 3.448, over two hours ago without any performance breaks, and we have no idea how Hektor might have guessed that Paris is back in Troy. But somehow this feels like a completely natural plot progression because of how strongly Hektor's and Paris's relationship was drawn in their encounter several episodes ago. Here again, Hektor expresses his frustration with his brother: 'I'll go look for Paris, so I can call him, if he'll listen to what I say' (ἐγὼ δὲ Πάριον μετελεύσομαι ὄφρα καλέσω/αἶ κ' ἐθέλησ' εἰπόντος ἀκούμεν, 6.280f.). Hektor's conditional suggests he fully expects Paris *not* to listen to him; this again gives the illusion of a shared past between them that Hektor bases his expectations on, while it also plays on the audience's narrative memory of the tension between the brothers that they have already seen.

Mission impossible: 6.286–311

In the next beat, the narrator attaches to Hekabe and Laodike on their mission to get the woven cloth for an offering and to lay it at Athena's feet and pray, following Helenos's and Hektor's orders (cf. 6.86–98; 6.286–310). But the narrative lends two ominous details to their mission that point to its impossibility in succeeding, playing on those ironies that previous beats have brought in as to why it might fail (cf. 6.241). The first is implicit, when the narrative mentions that Paris brought the cloth that Hekabe chooses as an offering on his same trip when he

brought Helen to Troy (6.290–2): so Hekabe’s offering to Athena is linked to Paris’s original crimes, not just of taking Helen, but, obliquely, of slighting Athena in the Judgement. The narrator then explicitly says that the offerings fail, as he describes Athena ‘turning her head away’ (ἀνένευε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, 6.311), refusing the Trojan women’s prayer to have pity on them, and their city, and their young children (6.309f.).

Mission (Paris and Helen): 6.312–68

The next beat jumps back to Hektor, fulfilling the audience’s expectation to see him on his self-prescribed mission to find Paris (6.313; cf. 6.280–5). As with Hektor’s initial entrance into the city, the narrative gives us a clear setting for Hektor to move through, along with the backstory of Paris’s well-built home, near Priam’s palace and Hektor’s own home (6.314–7). Hektor already emphasized that he is covered in battle-filth (6.268) – here the narrative gives us a visual re-introduction of Hektor that focuses on his spear, eleven cubits long, gold-tipped and gleaming (6.318–20). This sets up a strong contrast with Paris, whom we find with Helen, readying his bow.⁷⁸ it also paints him as a warrior out of place, which this beat and the next will reinforce. Hektor speaks first to his brother, addressing him with another vocative: the affectionate, frustrated, ‘strange one’ (δαίμόνι, 6.326; cf. 2.190).⁷⁹ Then Hektor assumes Paris’s motivation for leaving the battlefield, chiding him for his ‘anger’ (χόλον τόνδ’, 6.326).⁸⁰ Like the exchange between Hekabe and Hektor, this projection of motivations gives the relationship, and the characters in it, more depth, hinting at a shared past being drawn on for guessing the other’s emotions. The *Iliad*’s melodramatic alignment structure comes into play again here: the audience knows Paris left the battlefield in an Aphrodite cloud-teleportation move (3.375–82), where he ended up in his bedroom, having sex with Helen (3.447f.); but Hektor does not know this. Hektor *does* know that Achilles has withdrawn from the fighting because of his anger (χόλον): Apollo tells the Trojans this at 4.512f. So perhaps Hektor has drawn this parallel. Or perhaps Paris is prone to having angry fits. The ambiguity of Hektor’s assumption forces the audience to engage, to access their own memories, to try to piece together who knows what, and why, in recalibrating their allegiance to either or both characters.

Hektor goes on to vaguely recap the battle sequences from beginning of Book 6 and much of Book 5 under the Achaian onslaught, simply saying the people are dying, giving us a glimpse of the carnage still happening on the battlefield while

the audience is attached to Hektor inside Troy's walls (6.327f.). In giving a cause for the men dying and fighting, Hektor also reasserts Paris's role in starting the conflict (6.327–9; cf. 3.46–51; 3.99f.). Finally, he says that Paris himself would have fought with a man who avoided his war duties (6.329f.): this also adds depth to their relationship and to their characters, suggesting that in Hektor's past experience, Paris has shown himself to be a capable military commander, and that they *share* this value of punishing deserters.⁸¹ Hektor is not necessarily a 'reliable' narrator, but he has hardly been praising of his brother so far (cf. 3.39–57), so an audience might accept this piece of information about Paris's character. Hektor ends his speech asking Paris to get up and save the city from burning (6.331): it is the first time Hektor imagines the end of Troy, but it is hopeful, and invests quite a lot of faith in Paris as a possible saviour for the city.

Paris responds with the same line he responded to Hektor with before: 'Hektor, you've told me off right – not more than what's right' ("Ἕκτορ ἐπέι με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνεΐκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν, 6.333 = 3.59), again suggesting a relationship that has a past beyond the epic itself, where Paris is used to Hektor telling him off. Then Paris, like Hektor with Hekabe before him, moves to correct the other's assumptions, claiming that it was not anger that drove him off the battlefield, but 'grief' (ἄχρει, 6.366).⁸² Here, too, the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure plays with audience knowledge of previous events in contrast to that of its characters. The audience knows that Paris was not grieving when he arrived back in his bedroom with Helen. But they do not know what he has been doing since then, so Paris's declaration (as much as Hektor's finding him 'readying his bow') creates the illusion of continuity between his last appearance and now, a lived experience that the audience just has not directly seen. In this illusion, the narrative forces us to question what he has *actually* been feeling (and performance could play on this ambiguity), and this level of engagement would create allegiance, negative or not, to his character. Then Paris again excuses himself of any wrongdoing towards the Trojans, while, casual as ever, he says his wife says (and he thinks, too) it might be best to get back to battle (6.337–9). 'Victory, you know, can go both ways' (6.339; cf. 3.439f). Here, again, Paris's lack of consideration for the oaths sworn might unsettle the attentive audience. Paris ends his response with the same kind of casual options that he did in his last exchange with Hektor: 'now wait for me . . . or go' (6.340f.; cf. 'now if you want me to fight' at 3.67). The exchange once again deepens both characters, particularly Paris, through these subtle strategies of constructing their shared pasts that their present dialogue draws on. Hektor's 'mission' to find his brother resolves, but we see as the beat switches, that Hektor quickly gives himself a new mission.

The beat changes as Helen addresses Hektor and she immediately defines his relationship with her as she calls him ‘my brother-in-law’ (δάερ ἐμεῖο, 6.344). Helen wishes she had died, ‘before these things happened’ (πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι, 6.348): this tips to the traditional audience, who would need no filling-in as to what ‘things’ (ἔργα) she refers to; this also responds to Hektor’s own reference to the start of the Trojan War at 6.328f. Then she insults Paris, whose heart is ‘not steadfast’, ‘but’, she says, ‘I think he will pay’ (τὼ καί μιν ἐπαυρήσεσθαι ὄω, 6.353): her use of the future creates anticipation (will he pay in *this* story?) but it would also resonate with traditional audience members who know Paris’s fate.⁸³ Then she asks Hektor to sit, and recaps *his* social role, as the one ‘whom the war-work falls on most’ (6.355, cf. Helenos at 6.77). Last, she once again reiterates that it is for her and Paris that this war rages, reinforcing Hektor’s view at 6.327–9, and she says that songs will be sung of them (6.356–8) – a wonderful meta-poetic moment.⁸⁴ This, too, is a moment where Helen winks at the audience, an audience that must realize in that moment that they are listening (right now) to one of those songs sung about Paris and Helen. These meta-poetic moments happen all the time in serial television, often to the delight of the viewer.⁸⁵

The narrative repeats Hektor’s name and epithets ‘great’ and ‘shiny-helmed’ (μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ, 6.359), which, like with Hekabe (6.263), reasserts Hektor’s battlefield image in this domestic space before he responds (cf. 2.816, 3.324, 5.680). He calls Helen by name, and, rather than give her role, simply says that she ‘loves’ him. But he refuses to sit down, saying that his heart is already ordering him to go back to the battlefield and fight for his men who long for him in his absence (6.361f.). Hektor knows he is out of place, knows he has to get back. He enlists Helen as a last aid to complete his self-imposed ‘mission’ of bringing Paris back, asking her to rouse him (6.363f.). But now he gives himself yet another new mission, to see his family again, since he is not sure whether he will make it back this way again, or if the Achaians will kill him (6.365–8). So this new mission looks forward to Hektor’s encounter with his family in the next beat, but also to the farther-off possibility of his death: the juxtaposition is intentionally and successfully pathetic.⁸⁶ Hektor pushes aside Helen and Paris for his men, and for his own family.

Mission (Andromache): 6.369–502

The narrative keeps the audience attached to Hektor as he goes and looks for his family. It is not just the previous beat, where Hektor set out his new mission,

which has built up our anticipation for his encounter with Andromache. The last episodes have seen a slew of hints at the connection between warriors on the battlefield and their wives and children at home. Hektor has, right now, an opportunity to see his family again, an opportunity that Pandaros did not have: that we might still wonder if Sarpedon will have (he will not). If the audience already knows that he is going to die, it makes every moment of this encounter particularly meaningful. And for all these reasons, the narrative builds to it a little longer, milks the anticipation of the moment for all that it is worth.⁸⁷ The narrator attaches to Hektor so that the audience is with him when he does not find Andromache, and shares in that experience with him. Then the narrator plays up the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure, and gives the audience extra knowledge that it does not share with Hektor, that Andromache stands on the ramparts, tearfully lamenting (πύργῳ ἐφεστήκει γοώσά τε μυρομένη τε, 6.373),⁸⁸ an important image for both the next beats and for future episodes. In terms of structure, the narrative portrays two parallel actions, as with a split screen, or a cut, that makes them both extremely significant: Andromache watching the battlefield, lamenting the fates of the Trojans; Hektor at home, looking for his wife.⁸⁹ Like Hektor's speech to Paris, where he said that men fighting around the city and the wall were dying (λαοὶ μὲν φθινύθουσι περὶ πόλιν αἰπύ τε τεῖχος/ μαρνάμενοι 6.327f.), Andromache's action draws the audience's attention to the parts of the storyworld that the narrator does not show us. Andromache's being on the walls makes her an internal audience for actions the audience has not seen, and cannot see, because they are with Hektor, so it is another way in which the narrative creates the illusion of continuity in its different storylines. The audience do know that the Trojans were on their back foot when it attached to Hektor as he came to Troy (cf. 6.73–101): the maid that Hektor asks about Andromache's whereabouts tells us that she went to the wall because she had heard the Trojans are losing (6.386f.). Hektor is not the only thing that connects the battlefield to Troy.

When Hektor hears Andromache is at the wall, he turns back the way he came, and the narrative is startlingly unclear whether or not he is still looking for Andromache: he heads for the gates, from where he is just about to go back into the fray (τῆ ἄρ' ἔμελλε διεξιμεναι πεδῖον δέ, 6.393). The narrative keeps the audience attached to him, causing them to think, for a moment, that he might miss her.

But there she is – she is coming, running to her husband (6.394). The beat takes time to clearly introduce Andromache first *through* Hektor: his richly-dowered wife (ἄλοχος πολύδωρος, 6.394), then her name, Andromache, then

she is the daughter of great-hearted Eëtion (6.395). Hektor's name, too, repeats, when the narrative again restates their relationship, when it finishes introducing Eëtion: 'his daughter belonged to bronze-helmed Hektor' ("Εκτορι χαλκοκορυστή, 6.398).⁹⁰ The narrative also re-introduces Hektor in the introduction of their son, strongly establishing their relationship: Skamandrios is the boy's proper name, but others call him Astyanax, because Hektor alone guards the city (οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτωρ, 6.403). This confirms audience experience of Hektor from several previous beats: Hektor with his large shield, running towards Troy (6.116–8); Hekabe seeing Hektor as defending his neighbours (6.261); Hektor himself saying that his heart compelled him to get back to the battlefield (6.361f.). But also further back, to Sarpedon's accusation, only about an hour ago now, that Hektor boasted he 'alone' could defend the city (οἷος, 5.474).⁹¹

Amidst these introductions, the narrative litters the two's encounter with gestures: a particular kind of visual vividness (*enargeia*) that, like some of the most graphic wounds in the *Iliad*, stays in the mind long after.⁹² Hektor smiles at the child (6.404); Andromache (like Hekabe before her, 6.253), takes Hektor's hands and cries (6.405): these kind of gestures happen throughout the scene. Television serial narratives use similar techniques to mark out relationships, particularly romantic relationships, as memorable. In the sixth episode of *Alias*'s second season, Sydney and Vaughn, romantically interested in each other but not yet romantically involved, have to be quarantined together. The beat before a commercial break sees nearly thirty seconds of silence as Sydney walks over to Vaughn, sits down, he sits next to her, puts his arm around her, and she rests his head on his shoulder. After the break, Vaughn watches Sydney sleep, she wakes up, smiles, he smiles back at her – another twenty seconds of silence. One of these gestures was significant enough that Vaughn references it two seasons later, delighting devoted audience members, when he asks Sydney to marry him: 'Sometimes I wake up before you do, and I watch you sleep. And I'm overwhelmed, because, you're so amazing ...'⁹³ For 'shippers', those who encourage romantic relationships between main characters in serial narratives, these kind of small gestures mean everything.

After this strongly painted meeting between husband and wife, Andromache speaks first. Andromache's speech looks forwards and backwards, while contributing significantly to our understanding of her character, of Hektor, and, oddly, of Achilles. First, she tells Hektor that his *menos* will kill him and that he is without pity in letting this happen, in letting her become a widow and his son an orphan (6.407–9). She makes Hektor's battle-fury an inherent trait, something *his* (τὸ σὸν μένος, 6.407), not connected to past action (compared to how

Sarpedon seemed to view Hektor's battle-fury at 5.472). But she does suggest that it will cause his death at the Achaians' hands (6.409f.), echoing Hektor's own consideration of his possible death, just a few moments earlier (6.368). Then Andromache gives us her backstory, which intersects with and builds on Achilles' own past. When he sacked Thebe, Achilles killed her father and killed all her seven brothers on the same day (6.421–4). This was not part of Achilles' description of his sacking that city to Thetis (1.366; now around four and a half hours ago without considering breaks), but here it adds depth and credence to this shared past between the characters. Andromache also creates a picture of Achilles as a fair warrior: he burned Eëtion in his armour and buried him, out of respect (6.417–9), and he ransomed her mother (6.425–8). This is the second time in this episode that a character makes mention of Achilles in a speech to Hektor (6.99f.; twenty minutes ago), as though these characters remind Hektor (and, in turn, the audience) that Achilles is waiting.

Andromache then shifts to the more recent past when she asks Hektor to defend Troy from the spot near the fig tree where she has seen the greatest Achaian warriors rushing the wall, listing the Aiantes, Idomeneus, the Atreidai, Diomedes (6.430–7). This new information invites the audience to try to remember any of these attacks, though they have not happened within the narrative time: they give depth to this war, and Andromache's experience of it, and her knowledge of their Achaian enemies. At the same time, her request necessarily builds anticipation for what Hektor will say in response: the audience knows that he claimed with Helen that he wanted to get back to his men (6.361f.); tradition dictates that he must die, out there, on the battlefield.

Hektor (again here great, shiny-helmed, 6.440) responds to her, that all these things matter to him, too (6.441). But he must fight; his sense of shame is too great not to (6.441–6): Hektor's response gives the audience access to his motivations and how he understands himself within his social system that invites audience allegiance. But as soon as he has said this, Hektor, too, looks forward, in a way that confirms all of Andromache's worst fears. Hektor says that he knows that Troy will fall, ominously repeating Agamemnon's own words after the oath was broken, Menelaos shot (6.447–9=4.163–5, about two hours ago), suggesting that Hektor, too, recognizes that the Trojans have broken their oaths. This is a melodramatic ploy that surprises, this shared knowledge between the audience and two such disparate people, Agamemnon and Hektor. This kind of shared knowledge, whether or not it directly speaks to the broken oaths, comments on the world beyond the individual character, on a fixed set of rules that affects everyone within the world no matter the side they are on. It is like

when in *The Wire*, over and over again, in the mouths of cops and teachers and drug dealers you get ‘the game is rigged’ or in *Game of Thrones*, when from Missandei and Arya you get ‘valar morghulis’ (‘all men must die’).

Hektor then moves beyond this prediction and creates a hierarchy of whom he cares about most *based* on that prediction: Trojans, Priam, Hekabe, brothers, Andromache (6.450–4).⁹⁴ Andromache is first. He sees his own death, and through that death, framed by that death, he sees the tears of Andromache, he sees each future grief inflicted upon her by some Achaian. He *sees* her. All those warnings in previous episodes about the rapes of women, the death of children, the far-off wives who will not greet their husbands returning from war;⁹⁵ all these add up to this moment, create this moment, but are left as shadows by the strength of Hektor’s image of the enslaved Andromache (6.454–63).⁹⁶ All he can do is say that he hopes he is dead when it happens (6.464f.), and of course, he will be. He must be. With this speech, the *Iliad* finally gives us real access to Hektor, and we judge him for it. Feel what you may about this speech, but you feel something. You will care, in one way or another, about what will happen to Hektor.

Then the narrator gives us another series of vivid gestures that leave the family portrait lingering in our mind long after. Hektor reaches out for his son, who is terrified of his father in his helmet: the helmet that has identified him so often so far in the narrative, and that also reminds the audience of his battlefield gore-spattered appearance (6.466; cf. 6.266–8). Both parents laugh and Hektor takes off his helmet, quite literally giving the audience access to another side of him, before grabbing up his son in his arms and praying to Zeus (6.471–81). His prayer hopes for better things for his son, that he should grow up strong, rule Ilium well, and be better than his father; that he should kill his enemy, bring home the gory spoils, delight his mother (6.476–81). The prayer provides another raft of values that the audience can judge Hektor by (and can judge others against): but perhaps the greatest point of his prayer is that his son *survive*. That is what killing your enemy and bringing home spoils to a delighted mother means: it means that his enemy has not killed him. It means that his mother has not been taken captive. And as much as this prayer feels more optimistic than his response to Andromache (she remains free in this version), in both, Hektor sees a future where he is no more.

It feels as though Andromache responds to Hektor’s future absence when she cries as Hektor hands her son back to her (6.482–4).⁹⁷ Hektor does not let her tears go unnoticed: he *sees* (νοήσας, 6.484) and touches her cheek, and tries to reassure her. These tender gestures and even the fact of Hektor’s continuing

conversation (he talks to her longer than he has spoken to anyone) confirm his own statements about this relationship being his most valued. His speech acknowledges his death, which both of them have been speaking about: he tries to reassure her, that he will only die when it is fated and that everyone must die anyway (6.487–9). Hektor tells Andromache to go home, do her work. He will go to the battlefield, do his (6.490–3). The ‘problem’ of Hektor seeing her one last time because he might die, which he proposed at 6.364–8, resolves. Life goes on, as it must, until it does not. Hektor puts his helmet back on (6.494f.). Now all that remains is the other part of his last ‘mission’ that he expressed to Helen (6.361f.): he must return to his men.

The narrator leaves Hektor, for the first time since the women went to the temple (6.312, over ten minutes ago), and the audience attaches instead to Andromache, who keeps looking backwards at Hektor as she returns to his home, the home of ‘man-slaughtering’ Hektor (6.498). Like Andromache’s lamenting on the wall when the narrator first showed her (6.372f.), when she gets home the women raise the lament for Hektor while he is still alive (6.500–2). The narrator identifies him as a killer; the women lament him for being killed. These two are linked, and in switching alignment to Andromache and the household women, the narrative invites the audience to join in the lament for a man it has been following around, meeting the ones who love him. This invitation presents quite a powerful possibility for a break, with two of Hektor’s three missions ‘accomplished’, leaving the audience to linger on the doomed, fragile beauty of Hektor’s family.

Killing Time

Jason Mittell's *Complex TV* has a chapter on Beginnings, and a chapter on Ends. Nothing on middles. Middles are difficult. How do serial narratives keep audiences engaged, once they have established a world? By the time that Paris finds Hektor at the gates of Troy and the two rush back onto the battlefield (6.502–7.7), an audience would have sat through nearly five hours of performance, with several possible breaks. For Hektor, it marks a new chapter, because the audience returns to the battlefield with several new perspectives on him as a character. Now the audience knows first-hand why Hektor fights and what the stakes are when he fights. These many scenes of alignment with Hektor will have created some sense of allegiance with him as he runs back out onto the field.

When the narrative leaves Troy behind in this beat sequence, it also leaves behind all the characters therein: the audience is left now to wonder about the 'continuing' storylines of Hekabe, of Helen, of Andromache, just as much as it must remember that Achilles still sits apart by his ships or Aias still fights in the field. The narrative has taken enough time to draw these absent characters so that the audience now anticipates their eventual returns to the story; but as the serial narrative continues, it will continue to use its narrator and its other characters to remind the audience of them in their absence.

At the same time, the narrative has also established the world enough so that the audience feels familiar with it, able to recognize patterns that start to emerge. By now, an audience will have seen all of the *Iliad's* 'type-scenes',¹ and their ability to recognize these patterns (and their disruptions) will be a source of pleasure moving forward. Other serial narratives also engage in these 'callbacks', which can range from a repeated line to an entire scenario that emulates or reflects an earlier one.

In the final season of *Lost*, characters continually find themselves in situations that mirror earlier events in the series, from as far back as the first season. Called "callbacks" by fans, these series-long echoes, often quite faint, reward committed viewers as insiders.²

Five years into *Lost* is hardly the same as five hours into the *Iliad*, but the *Iliad*'s demands of attention are greater as its memory cues are constrained in the words of a single, embodied performer rather than in the intensely visual and aural medium of television.³ Callbacks are different than simple recaps, because they re-cast past information in surprising new ways for the audience who can appreciate their repeated pattern. The *Iliad* has already used callbacks, like in Hektor's repetition of Agamemnon's fall of Troy (6.447–9 = 4.163–5); callbacks of both language and scene will become more prominent as the epic moves forward.

Once the serial has established its world and its characters, it cannot move forward *too* quickly. So the narrative also introduces new physical spaces and new characters, or foregrounds established characters for the first time and expands its world laterally so that the impact of forward-leaning events can be diffused across an even wider network of personal responses and diegetic retellings. Hektor, too, will continue to be refracted through an ever-expanding array of interlocutors.

Maybe next time: 6.503–7.16

Moving away from Andromache, the next beat cuts to Paris. The narrative follows him from his home down through the streets of the city, like a pony prancing in the sunlight (6.506–13), armour glinting like the sun (6.513). This sudden shift could be good place for a performance break, but whether or not the performer would stop here, Paris's eagerness and his clean, golden armour juxtapose starkly with the previous beat's lamentations raised over Hektor, still spattered in battle-filth (cf. 6.268), painting a full-circle of the battle cycle in just a few minutes' time. But it is more specific than that: the fact that it is Hektor's 'funeral' that immediately precedes Paris's battle excitement implicitly links the two, reinforcing Helen's statement, that on Hektor the war-work falls the most, for the sake of her and Paris (6.355f.).

Paris comes upon Hektor, 'who was about to turn away from the place he spoke to his wife' (εὖτ' ἄρ' ἐμελλε/ στρέψουσθ' ἐκ χώρης ὄθι ἧ ὀάριζε γυναικί, 6.515f.). This recaps the last beat, again allowing for the performer to break, but it also paints a poignant picture of Hektor, stood still, staring after Andromache. These Paris-beats frame both sides of Hektor's encounter with Andromache; fitting since he is the cause of their tragedy. In this beat, inverting audience expectation from the last two encounters between them we have seen (cf. 3.38–75;

6.325–41), Paris talks to Hektor first, which keeps the audience more firmly aligned with Paris. Paris makes fun of his brother, jokingly asking if he has come too late, when he knows that he has not, because Hektor still stands here (6.517–19). Hektor responds and says that no one could fault Paris; he can fight just fine, he just holds back. But still, it hurts Hektor when he hears the taunts of the Trojans, who fight because of him (6.523–5). Again, this picture of Paris builds on the brothers' shared past experience that the audience has no other access to (cf. 6.329f.), a past where Paris has been a fine warrior. Hektor ends his speech with a hope, a prayer; 'but let's go – someday we'll make all this right with the immortal gods in heaven, if Zeus ever lets us ...' (ἀλλ' ἵομεν· τὰ δ' ὀπισθεν ἀρεσσόμεθ', αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς/ δῶη ἐπουρανόισι θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησι, 6.526–8). Hektor still blames Paris, but he sees the good in him, too. And even though we just heard Hektor say that he knew Troy would fall (6.447–9, five minutes ago), here he reassures his brother with a vision of the future where they survive, 'when we kick the Achaians with their nice greaves out of Troy' (ἐκ Τροίης ἐλάσαντας ἔυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς, 6.529). Is Hektor more comfortable with Andromache, that he tells her the truth? Does he care more about her? Or is he trying to protect Paris's feelings of guilt, or inspire Paris back into battle? Does Hektor change his tone slightly with Paris because they are alone? Does his encounter with Andromache leave him more sentimental? These questions are important, because just as the audience 'knows' Hektor now – they have seen him across many encounters, seen him say what he thinks to a variety of people – they must now accommodate all these encounters in a way that makes sense. Hektor is a surface with many angles: the audience must try to guess the shape of its whole. The messiness of Hektor saying one thing one moment and seemingly something else entirely the next adds a realistic complexity to his character and his relationships that ask an audience to engage with them and to try to understand them.⁴

Hektor and Paris then return to battle much to the joy of their troops, with an extended simile that describes the Trojan troops' joy at their appearance like sailors exulting in a long-awaited for fresh wind (7.4–7). This simile confirms Hektor's statement that his men long for him when he is away from battle (6.362), and gives further justification to his speech to Andromache, that he *must* return to his men (6.440–6).

But in grouping Hektor and Paris together when describing the Trojans' happy response (ἀμφοτέροι μέμασαν, 7.3; τῷ Τρώεσσιν ἐελδομένοισι φανήτην, 7.7), the narrative resets much of what it has established before. The Trojans' relief here directly contradicts, or perhaps, effaces, how they hated Paris when he

disappeared from his single combat with Menelaos (3.454), and no one mentions Paris's prior absence from the battlefield or the broken oaths. This lack of emotional continuity feels like a rupture, but necessarily resets the plot so that it can move forward.⁵

As though justifying his men's joy at his return to battle, Paris and Hektor both have successful kills when they return to battle: Paris kills Menesthios and Hektor kills Eioneus (7.8–12). But then Glaukos appears for the first time since the catalogue (6.119; cf. 2.876) with his kill following Hektor's, and getting four lines for his kill compared to Hektor's two (7.13–16).

Callback: 7.17–91

After this series of kills for the Trojan side, the narrative switches the audience's alignment to Athena, who sees them killing the Argives, and then attaches to her as she heads to Troy (7.17–20). Then the narrative cuts and attaches to Apollo (7.21), who leaves his perch in Pergamum to meet Athena, which creates continuity with where the narrative left him in the 'episode' before last (5.460). Apollo asks Athena if she intends to give the Danaans the victory, significantly recapping that Athena has no pity for the Trojans (7.27; cf. 6.311). But for now, Apollo wants to put aside war and hatred (7.29f.), since, as he assures Athena, the Achaians and Trojans will fight again (7.30), and Troy will someday fall (7.30–2). Athena agrees, and so this proposal creates audience anticipation, not just for the single combat between Hektor and an as-yet-unnamed Achaian, but also for when both sides will fight again, and when Troy will fall. At the same time, this proposal calls back to Paris's proposal for single combat in Book 3 (3.67–75), which also saw a temporary truce during a single combat.

The alignment shifts from the gods when Helenos (unusually) overhears their conversation, and approaches Hektor with the idea.⁶ Here, Helenos repeats Hektor's role as Priam's son and then adds that he is 'the equal of Zeus in cleverness' (Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντε, 7.47). Helenos urges Hektor to call for single combat, relaying the gods' idea (7.49–51 recaps 7.38–40). Helenos also assures Hektor that he has heard from the gods that 'it is not yet your fate to die, or to meet your destiny' (οὐ γάρ πώ τοι μοῖρα θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν, 7.52). If it is true, this assurance matters as the narrative has mentioned Hektor's death five times in the last fifteen minutes of performance time (Hektor, 6.366f.; Andromache, 6.407; Hektor, 6.462–5; Hektor, 6.486–8; the narrator of the house mourning, 6.500–2).⁷ But the audience has also heard the gods' dialogue (7.22–43), and they did not mention

Hektor's survival. This ambiguity adds tension to the coming duel, because the audience does not yet know that Hektor will certainly live, particularly since they do not yet know which Achaian he will face.⁸

The set-up for the duel involves a fair bit of revising the past, just as with the Trojan response to Paris's return to the battlefield. As Hektor comes forward, he blames Zeus for not allowing the truce between the Achaians and Trojans to stand (7.69–72 recaps 4.1–147). Hektor's recap does align with the narrator's superior knowledge that Zeus would not let the oaths stand (3.332). But Hektor's recap also significantly omits any Trojan guilt, Pandaros's arrow and even Book 3's duel between Paris and Menelaos. In doing this, Hektor resets the action, and moves forward by swearing a new oath (more of an affirmed promise, since no one ever responds to it or swears with him) where he details out what should be done with his body should he die, and what he will do with the body of his opponent (7.77–91).⁹ Just a few lines after Helenos has assured us that Hektor will not die in this fight, Hektor himself re-introduces the idea of his death, and more, a concern with his corpse, and the roles of the Trojans and the Trojan women in the event of his death (7.79f.). This looks forward to Hektor's eventual death and picks up on his household's lamentations for him in Troy (6.497–502), but the stakes are higher now, because now he is once more on the battlefield, once more entering combat. Hektor finishes his speech with his opponent's death and memorial, and he dedicates more lines to that death (eleven to four), which speaks to his confidence moving forward (7.81–91).¹⁰

Achaians: 7.92–213

In the next beat, the narrative switches to Menelaos, who is the first of a series of Achaians to respond to Hektor's single combat proposal. Menelaos takes up Hektor's challenge, shaming the other Achaians (7.96–102). The narrator first intervenes in Menelaos going ahead with his challenge, with an apostrophe and a contrafactual ('Hektor would have killed you, Menelaos!' 7.104f.). So the narrator reinforces his special relationship with Menelaos,¹¹ while also reiterating that Menelaos must and will survive this conflict (cf. 4.169–82; 5.564–70; 5.714–18). At the same time, it reflects on Hektor, and suggests that he was right to emphasise the death of his then-anonymous rival.¹²

Agamemnon's response to Menelaos confirms the narrative's assessment further when he stops Menelaos from fighting, warning him that 'even Achilles ... shudders to meet this man' (καὶ δ' Ἀχιλλεύς τούτῳ γε μάχῃ ἔνι κυδιανείρη/

ἔρριγ' ἀντιβολῆσαι, 7.113). Both these evaluations of Hektor are based on past experiences of him as a warrior that the audience does not share, though we have just seen him kill two men. But would Achilles actually be afraid of Hektor? Helenos suggested that all the Trojans feared Achilles (6.99–101). But Achilles certainly respected Hektor enough to use him in his threat against Agamemnon (1.241–3). Here, Agamemnon adds about Hektor that 'even though (Hektor)'s fearless and can't get enough of battle . . . he'll gladly stop if he escapes the hateful fighting and bitter combat' (εἴ περ ἀδείης τ' ἐστὶ καὶ εἰ μόθου ἔστ' ἀκόρητος.../ αἶ κε φύγησι/ δηῖου ἐκ πολέμοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δηϊότητος, 7.117–19). Where Hektor saw only two outcomes to his proposed single combat, Agamemnon adds here another: that Hektor might quit fighting if it means getting to live. Now, looking forward, there are three possible outcomes for an audience to guess at in a duel that has not yet even set its second contestant (and those guesses would be different according to audience knowledge of tradition).

Nestor stands up next, to heap more shame on the cowardly Achaians, telling them of his single combat victory against Ereuthalion, which, if only he were younger, he would repeat now against Hektor (7.124–60). The old man's 'mythological paradigm' works,¹³ and no less than nine men 'were willing to stand up against Hektor' (7.169): this re-introduces Achaian heroes that have been absent from the narrative for around an hour of performance time. When Nestor suggests that they shake out lots (7.170–4), he builds anticipation for the next beat; he also looks forward to the emotional outcome of the fight when he says that whoever draws the lot to fight will gladden the Achaians, and his own heart, to come off the battlefield again whole (7.172–4). This builds anticipation for the audience that Aias might survive the contest.

Next the Achaians pray for Aias, Diomedes or Agamemnon, in that order, to draw the lot (7.179f.), implicitly suggesting that these three are the best Achaian warriors. This does not quite gel with the narrative so far (Odysseus has had more kills than Aias or Agamemnon),¹⁴ and so implies extra-narrative past performance (or traditional popularity) that the Achaians are judging these three with. Finally, Aias draws the lot, and the audience gets access to his happy response, since he thinks he can beat Hektor (δοκέω νικησέμεν Ἐκτορα διόν, 7.192). Here he emphasizes his war-knowledge and his upbringing (especially ἰδρεῖη at 7.198; τραφόμεν at 7.199), instantly creating a past for himself that gives depth to his character and builds further audience alignment with him moving into the combat. Then Hektor tells his men to pray to Zeus, and they pray that if Zeus loves Hektor, he should let each man have equal strength and equal honour (εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἐκτορά περ φιλέεις καὶ κήδεαι αὐτοῦ,/ ἴσην ἀμφοτέροισι βίην καὶ

κῦδος ὄπασσον. 7.203–5): this reinforces Agamemnon's idea that there might be a draw in the single combat (7.116–19).

After Hektor's time in Troy, the audience is more invested in him, and so more invested in the outcome of his duel. Through this series of Achaian responses to Hektor's challenge, the narrative exercises a push-pull over how an audience should rate Hektor as a fighter. First there is no Achaian brave enough to take him on (7.91f.); then Menelaos would lose against him (7.94–119); even Achilles would be scared of him (7.113f.); Nestor's too old to try (7.132–60); finally, nine stand up to challenge him (7.161–9), with Aias happy to be the one to take Hektor on (7.187–99). The previous beats also signal a shift from Hektor's proposed mortal combat to the Achaian men praying to Zeus for a draw (7.200–5). This complex dance leaves the audience guessing as to what will happen between Hektor and Aias (more of an unknown quantity in this narrative so far), even while these beats point towards the match's outcome.

Fight/Night: 7.214–312

The next beat sequence shows the actual duel. As Aias approaches in his armour, the narrative uses a quick series of emotional responses to direct the audience's allegiance and deepen existing character roles and relationships. First the Achaians are happy to see Aias walking into the fight (7.214). Then the Trojans are trembling and terrified to see Aias (7.214–5): a marked difference from their relief seeing Hektor and Paris re-enter battle just a couple of scenes ago (7.4–7). Finally the narrative turns to Hektor himself, whose knees shake, whose heart pounds, who would run away if only he had not called for this damn duel (7.216–18): along with this amazing moment of access, the narrative attaches the audience to Hektor as he stands his ground against the oncoming Aias. The narrative fixes Hektor, frozen in fear, in the centre of its frame as Aias approaches him with his shield, 'like a wall' (Αἴας δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων σάκος ἠὔτε πύργον, 7.219).¹⁵

The two men have an exchange before the fight itself begins. Aias, now established by the narrative as the aggressor, speaks first. He starts by looking forward when he tells Hektor that Hektor *will* know what sort of men the best Danaans are (εἴσσει, 7.226). But then he adds the caveat of 'even after Achilles' (7.228) and recaps the fact that Achilles is out of the action because of his anger at Agamemnon (7.229f.): this is the first time that Achilles' anger has been recapped since 4.512–4, over two hours ago in terms of performance time, and

more with breaks. Then Aias recaps the previous beat, as he boasts that *here* (implicitly not *there* by the ships with Achilles), ‘there are a lot of us who’ll take you on’ (ἡμεῖς δ’ εἰμὲν τοῖοι οἳ ἂν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν/ καὶ πολέες, 7.230f.), reminding us that there were no fewer than nine men who (eventually) wanted to face Hektor (this also recaps the Greeks outnumbering the Trojans in the catalogue, 2.123–8).

With these recaps out of the way, Hektor’s speech focuses more on his own character, playing off of Aias’s earlier speech at 7.191–9. Hektor’s speech is all confidence and adds contrasting access to what the narrative provided before when Hektor was afraid before the battle (7.216–18). Now, Hektor tells Aias off for trying him out like some ‘boy or woman who doesn’t know the war-work’ (7.235f.). Then he asserts that he *knows* his war-work,¹⁶ knows how to fight, kill, move, use his shield, run in with the horses, dance the metres of the war-god (7.237–41). Of course, Hektor must know all these things: he is a warrior with a fearful reputation who has survived nine years of the Trojan War. But there are disparities here that the audience is left to contend with, and again, this requires a high level of engagement with Hektor’s character. Is Hektor *still* afraid of Aias now (cf. 7.216–18)? Maybe he is not: all of us have experienced a pre-event anxiety that disappears once the event starts, whether it be competing in sports, or taking an exam, or giving a presentation. But if he is still afraid, is he disguising his fear? The performance of this scene could drastically alter our understanding of Hektor’s character: whether the performer has fear in his voice when he says these things, or foolish boastfulness, or steely confidence would completely change the dynamics of the exchange, with each possibility posing its own sets of ambiguities for the audience to tackle as the fight begins. His final statement pushes audience curiosity further, in its awkward declaration of bravery: ‘But I don’t want to hit such a man as you are, watching you in an ambush, but upfront, if I can.’ (ἀλλ’ οὐ γάρ σ’ ἐθέλω βαλέειν τοιοῦτον ἐόντα/ λάθρη ὀπιπεύσας, ἀλλ’ ἀμφιδόν, αἶ κε τύχωμι, 7.243f.) Does this imply that in other circumstances, or with a different person, Hektor would sit in ambush to kill his opponent?

The combat beat sequence continues to build suspense as it goes between the warriors from Hektor’s first spear-throw. With each battle beat, it is clear that Aias has the advantage, but between beats, the narrative re-establishes parity between the two men. First Hektor’s spear only goes through six of the eight layers of Aias’s shield (7.245–8); but Aias’s goes right the way through Hektor’s, and through his corselet, and even through his tunic (7.248–53): Hektor ducks and just avoids dark death (ὃ δ’ ἐκλίνθη καὶ ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν, 7.254). But then they are *both* like flesh-eating lions (7.256), they are *both* like wild boars (7.257).

Next, Hektor stabs his spear again into Aias's shield, but once again cannot penetrate it (7.257–9); but Aias's spear goes straight through Hektor's shield (cf. 7.251), this time drawing blood from Hektor's neck (7.260–2). Hektor keeps going, throwing a large rock that clashes against Aias's shield (7.264–7); but Aias gets a bigger rock and throws, knocking Hektor flat on his back so that Apollo must set him upright (7.268–72). Each time, Aias has a clear edge over Hektor. But once again, the narrative pulls back from calling advantage Aias, saying 'now they would have kept stabbing with their swords, fighting hand to hand' (καὶ νύ κε δὴ ξιφέεσσ' αὐτοσχεδὸν οὐτάζοντο, 7.273), suggesting that *both* men would have kept going, without any indication of an advantage between them when the heralds intervene because of the encroaching darkness (7.274–82).

The intervention stops the fight. The heralds assign the same parity that the narrative has here and there been asserting: Zeus loves both men (7.280), fulfilling the Achaians' prayer about Zeus loving Hektor (7.201–5). Better, the heralds play now on the audience's shared experience, imposing a shared evaluation on the fight that they have just witnessed: 'Both men are fighters. We have all seen that now.' (ἄμφω δ' αἰχμητά· τό γε δὴ καὶ ἴδμεν ἅπαντες, 7.281) We have seen Hektor struggling; have the characters seen something else?

Aias lets Hektor decide whether or not to call the fight (7.284–6), with the reminder that it was Hektor who first called for the fight, now about fifteen minutes ago (7.67–91). Hektor agrees to call the fight in a long speech that looks forward to both sides' positive response to seeing their heroes come out of a fight alive, spending slightly more time on his own return (happy Achaians at 7.294f.; happy Trojans and Trojan women at 7.296–8). This picks up on the predicted possibility of a draw from earlier (7.204f.),¹⁷ but it is also a callback to the previous happy return of a warrior in danger that the narrative showed with Aineias (5.514–16). The narrative also unevenly treats Hektor's return against Aias's, spending five lines on Hektor's return, with just one line on Aias's return before and after (7.306–12).¹⁸ This disparity more accurately reflects the danger to both men in the battle itself, where Hektor was in more danger throughout, so his escape is more remarkable. Hektor also had no second; Aias had eight others who would take his place should he have fallen in his combat against Hektor. But more, from the time in Troy with Hektor, the narrative has built more audience allegiance for Hektor than it has for Aias.

Just as the duel in Book 3 had to end with both Menelaos and Paris still alive in order for the narrative to progress, so does this duel.¹⁹ So rather than having an outcome that explicitly advances the plot, the duel focuses intensely on the emotional outcomes for the narrative's characters. As the battle sequences from

Books 4 and 5 begin to demonstrate the threats that face warriors on the battlefield, and begin to introduce the ramifications of a warrior's death for those at home, the sequences in Book 6 showed us an extended example of the emotional stakes of a warrior's death involved for those at home, and for Hektor's death in particular. This latest sequence brings those two concepts back together, showing us both the delight of the Trojan men in seeing their military leaders return to the field, but also the delight of both sides (and, more particularly, the Trojan side) at having their men return safe and sound from mortal combat. While the duel feels as though it has not moved the narrative forward at all, it has done a great deal in terms of furthering our emotional investment in the narrative's characters, and those character arcs – particularly Hektor's – and their ambiguities keep the audience engaged while the plot meanders forward through these middle books.

Wall alignment: 7.313–44

While the single combat resolves, the issue of Apollo saying that the Trojans and the Achaians will fight again remains dangling (7.30), and the 'episode' only looks backwards briefly to the duel before setting the problem that will dominate the next beat sequence. The narrative keeps the audience attached to Aias as he makes his way back to the Achaian camp, and when the Achaians make sacrifices and feast, Agamemnon honours Aias by giving him the best cut of meat, implicitly acknowledging his victory in the duel (7.321f.; cf. 7.312). Then Nestor suggests that they gather and burn their dead (7.326–35) and build ramparts over the burial mound (7.336–43). The first part of Nestor's orders will see the action through to the end of the book; the second suggestion will start a new story arc that will dominate the best part of the next several hours.

The Achaian wall then expands the idea of story arcs being closely bound up in a single character, to include a focal point around which other characters can meet.²⁰ This makes sense as the narrative moves into an extended period of battle, where the narrative will necessarily ask us to track multiple characters on either side of the fight. In Jason Mittell's discussion of character in television serial, he says about *The Wire*:

... a scene might attach to one of dozens of characters whom the narrative differentiates and recognises. . . This vast breadth of attachment locates Baltimore itself as an immersive place functioning as the core aligned character, with its various inhabitants providing access to the city's interior subjectivity . . .²¹

While I would not go so far as to say that I think the Achaian wall has its own interiority, it will become a touch-point for a multiplicity of characters over the next several episodes, redefining many of their roles in direct relationship to itself.²² Aias will become the wall's main defender; Sarpedon and Hektor its main attackers; and action will now move back and forth around the wall to catch up with its primary characters.

Troy-time: 7.345–80

The scene switches from the Achaians to Troy, where Antenor addresses the Trojan assembly before Priam's palace (7.345–58). The narrator omits Hektor from the assembly, possibly because it would ruin the emotional impact of his last trip to Troy if now he returns there with another opportunity to hang out with Andromache.²³ Antenor tells the assembly that they should return Helen, since the Trojans fight on as oath-breakers (7.345–53). So Antenor significantly recaps Pandaros's divinely-inspired actions in Book 4 that made the Trojans into oath-breakers (4.124–40), and takes more responsibility than Hektor's call for single combat earlier in this episode had (7.69f.). Paris refuses to hand over Helen, but says that he will give back her possessions (7.362–4). Priam agrees that this shall be their offer, and adds that they will ask for permission to gather and bury their dead (7.366–78), looking forward to the next beats.

Death all round: 7.381–8.51

The narrative switches beats and follows Idaios the herald with his message to the Achaian side (7.381–97), where he is sure to qualify Paris's refusal to return Helen as against the Trojan wishes (7.390, 7.393). After a moment of silence, Diomedes steps forward to respond to the herald (7.399–402). The answer is no. No to taking back the possessions, no to taking back Helen, no to all of it. (7.400f.) 'It's known even to a fool that a verdict of death has fixed itself on the Trojans.' (7.402) This statement follows on Antenor's admission that the Trojans are oath-breakers and Paris's insistence that they remain oath-breakers in the previous beat (7.350–4; 7.357–64): Diomedes winks to the audience in saying that the consequences of both of these facts for the Trojan are already 'known' (γνωτὸν, 7.401). This obviously appeals to the audience, who will all know that Troy falls,

but still, it raises questions as to *how* the narrative will get to that fall, or if it will get to that fall at all.

In the beat sequence, the Trojans gather their bodies and firewood (7.417), and then the Achaians gather their bodies and firewood (7.420).²⁴ The sun starts to come up as the Trojans gather their dead (7.421), trying to recognize each man (7.423f.), weeping tears (7.424f.), but hushed by Priam, they burn the bodies (7.427–9). The Achaians do the same during the dawn,²⁵ building the wall over the burial mound that Nestor suggested (7.433–41; cf. 7.336–43). The beat switches by following the gaze of Poseidon, who sees the Achaians building the wall and complains to Zeus that the Achaians should have sacrificed first (7.446–53). So Zeus tells Poseidon to break the wall after the Achaians leave Troy (7.459–63). This gives a nod to tradition even beyond the fall of Troy.²⁶ Finally, evening falls on the Achaians, done with their work, feasting, and the Trojans in their city doing the same (7.464–77). But Zeus turns the Trojans green with fear, so that their cups spill, and they all must make an offering to Zeus (7.479–82).

For all its trickery in making the oaths sworn in Book 3 and broken in Book 4 disappear from the foreground through the duel in Book 7, the narrative then brings them back and shows their consequences. Antenor knows the Trojans are oath-breakers and ought to give up; Diomedes says it is already too late for the Trojans no matter what they do. Hektor's absence through these exchanges might point to his helplessness to change this; just as the burial of the corpses after shows his helplessness in having changed anything for those who have fallen, and looks forward to the fates of many more Trojans and Achaians yet to come. The sequences in Book 6 increased the stakes for Hektor and allowed him to express his values in the face of those stakes; those in Book 7 allow him to *show* us how his values stand up to stakes that keep increasing. But the narrative, with the mentions of the oath and oath-breaking, the impossibility of Helen's return, and even the building and foreshadowed destruction of the Achaian wall, forces us to take a historical perspective from which we can see that Hektor, for all our care – even, perhaps, for all of Zeus's care – cannot win.

With the dawn, the beat changes scenes to Olympos, where Zeus forbids further divine intervention in the war and threatens the other gods to keep out before he heads off alone to watch the battle from Mount Ida (8.1–52). So the battle starts up again, just as Apollo said that it would (7.29–32), ending the 'problem' of putting fighting aside for a while and suggesting a possible episode break between the books.²⁷ But in setting the rules for the coming combat, and in setting down Zeus on Mount Ida as a spectator, the narrative builds anticipation for the coming battle, and the role that Zeus will play in it.²⁸

Battle: 8.52–197

Now that the narrative has spent time establishing audience allegiance with Hektor in the scene in Troy, and in his single combat with Aias, Hektor takes on a greater role in this battle sequence. The battlefield, with the wall at its centre, becomes the focal point where the story arcs of Hektor, the lead Achaians, and the gods (particularly Zeus) converge, with the narrative rapidly switching audience alignment between them. These rapid alignment switches give the audience diverse opportunities to either change allegiance in accordance with narrative change, or to root for ‘favourite’ characters throughout. Battle shows how characters on either side cope with their allies, their enemies, and with the gods, revealing new character elements with each new interaction or response. This will be increasingly true for Hektor as he takes on a more major role in battle.

The narrative begins to bounce the audience’s allegiance back and forth between the Achaians and the Trojans before battle even begins. First, the narrative shows the Achaians, putting on their armour (8.53f.); then it switches to the Trojans (8.55–7). The narrative’s description of the Trojans provides more information about them, building alignment through both attachment and access, in a way that also recaps crucial information. First, there are fewer Trojans than there are Achaians (8.56 recaps 2.122–32). Next, the narrative gives the audience access as it describes the Trojans’ motivation of fighting under necessity’s yoke, to defend their wives and children (8.57). This builds on earlier scenes, including those in Book 6 that emphasize the need to defend the Trojan women and children from their fates (cf. 6.77–101). This narrative description of Trojan motivation invites allegiance to the Trojans, especially as the narrative here omits access to the Achaians, who are fighting to right the wrong of Helen’s abduction, or because of the broken oaths. The next beat sees the fighting start, but the scene quickly switches alignment to Zeus, who balances his scales of death and the Achaians’ death-day sinks (8.70–7), which looks forward to their failure in the battle.²⁹ These three beats create conflicting allegiances moving into the battle, expertly creating first the Trojans, and then the Achaians as underdogs. (Of course, audience allegiances will depend on cultural attitudes towards underdogs.)

As Zeus launches a thunderbolt to signal this Achaian death-day, the narrative allows access to the Achaians’ fear (8.77) as they flee, while it also names Idomeneus, Agamemnon, the Aiantes and Odysseus (8.78–98), foregrounding their characters after their minor roles through previous sequences.³⁰ Only Nestor remains on the battlefield, his horse struck by one of Paris’s arrows:³¹ in calling Paris ‘Helen’s husband, with her nice hair’ (8.80), the narrative recalls not

just Paris's abduction of Helen, but also his refusal to return her at 7.355, since he is *still* her husband. While Nestor tries to cut his chariot free from the dead horse, Hektor charges towards him (8.88–90).

The narrative uses its contrafactual knowledge to say that Nestor would have died there if Diomedes had not come to save him (8.90f.),³² building audience anticipation for how the 'saving' will unfold. Diomedes asks Odysseus to help him save Nestor, but Odysseus ignores him, making the scene more pathetic (8.91–8). This *pathos*, emphasized by the fact that Diomedes is 'alone' as he reaches Nestor, sets up a surprise when Diomedes encourages Nestor to come with him, in his chariot, to take on Hektor. So the beat looks forward to a confrontation with Hektor. And Diomedes is confident about that confrontation, as he refers to his Trojan horses that he took from Aineias (8.105–11), after beating Aineias in battle (5.319–27). In recapping a key element of his *aristeia* (just under two hours ago in performance time without break), Diomedes suggests that he is about to be excellent once again in this battle, further building audience anticipation for his confrontation with Hektor.

Aligning the audience first with Nestor and Diomedes this way, Hektor implicitly becomes their antagonist in this beat; first when we see him charging across the lines towards the stranded Nestor (8.88–90), then here again as Nestor and Diomedes draw close to him (8.116–19). But the narrative deftly switches sides when Diomedes hits Hektor's charioteer Eniopeus with a spear, and aligns the audience with Hektor, as it gives them access to the grief that closes over Hektor's heart ("Εκτορα δ' αἰνὸν ἄχος πύκασε φρένας ἠνιόχοιο, 8.124). The narrative keeps the audience attached to Hektor as he leaves Eniopeus lying on the battlefield, and goes in search of another charioteer, quickly enlisting Archeptolemos (8.124–26). Here the narrative employs yet another contrafactual,³³ saying that the fighting would have continued if Zeus had not seen them and sent a lightning bolt flying down right in front of Diomedes (8.131–6): this implies that the intervention is to *save* Hektor as Zeus tries to stop Diomedes.

The thunderbolt provides an opportunity to exploit the melodramatic alignment structure that this beat sequence has set up, as the beat switches to Nestor who then interprets and responds to it. Nestor reads the thunderbolt and tells Diomedes that they should relent, asking if he recognizes that Zeus's courage is no longer with him (8.139f.), as Zeus is now giving glory 'to this man', Hektor (τούτῳ, 8.141), elaborating on the previous beat. Diomedes says that he agrees, but he also fears that Hektor will tell the Trojans that Diomedes ran away from him (8.147–9). Diomedes employs a common habit of Hektor's – imagining

what someone else might say in a future scenario³⁴ – in thinking Hektor might openly mock him to the Trojans: whether this is based on Diomedes' past experience of Hektor or on how Hektor fits into the normal expectations of the *Iliad's* storyworld (or both), it speaks to a familiarity with Hektor which adds further depth to his character. Nestor's response does the same. Reassuring Diomedes, Nestor insists that the Trojans would not believe Hektor if he called Diomedes a coward, and nor will their wives, many of whom have lost their husbands to Diomedes on the battlefield (8.153–6). Here, Nestor refers to past actions that might include Diomedes' 'overhaul' *aristeia* of Book 5, with its many kills, and the Trojan wives' grief that was necessarily going to follow (6.237–41), but that also might refer to Diomedes' fighting history at Troy, extending past the bounds of the *Iliad*. So their exchange deepens both Nestor and Diomedes, while they also intensely imagine Hektor in his social contexts,³⁵ further reinforcing *his* social roles and character as well. With these firm re-introductions, Nestor and Diomedes charge into battle.

The next beat switches audience alignment back to the Trojans and Hektor. Hektor calls out to Diomedes, recapping Diomedes' own lineage and role (8.160f.): these strong character re-introductions must certainly allow for the performer to have taken a break between Books 7 and 8, before this battle sequence. But with or without a break, they build increasing audience recognition, alignment, and allegiance with the characters before they start into battle. Hektor says that Diomedes has been honoured most of all before, but then he tells Diomedes that the Achaians will now dishonour him (νῦν δέ σ' ἀτιμήσουσι, 8.163) and calls him 'like a woman' (γυναικὸς ἄρ' ἀντὶ τέτυξο, 8.163) and a 'plaything' (γλήνη, 8.164). In a way, Hektor's insults fulfil Diomedes' fear of Hektor's insults from the last beat (8.147–9), and confirm Diomedes' idea of Hektor's character as a 'boaster'.³⁶ Hektor then tells Diomedes that he will not sack the city with Hektor giving way, and that he will not carry away their women in the ships (8.164–6). Hektor's saying here that he will not allow the Trojan women to be taken away picks up on his earlier imagination, of Andromache working the loom and carrying the water of another man after his death (οὐδὲ γυναικάς/ ἄξεις ἐν νήεσσι, 8.155f.; cf. 6.454–65). Hektor ends his speech with the simple future: 'before then, I'll give you your fortune' (πάρος τοι δαίμονα δώσω, 8.166). This creates further audience anticipation for a fight between the two opposing heroes (cf. 6.73–82), and raises the question (especially for a non-traditional audience) as to whether Hektor can see his boasts through.

But the beat switches alignment back to Diomedes and provides the audience access to him as hesitates three times to keep attacking, with Zeus answering his

thoughts, again, with thunderbolts (8.167–71; cf. 8.133–62).³⁷ Then the beat switches again to Hektor, exhorting his men. Now Hektor interprets the thunderbolts to his men, as he provides access to something he ‘knows’ (γινώσκω, 8.175): that Zeus has nodded and granted him the glory (8.175f.). This raises ambiguity, as the audience must decide if this is part of Zeus’s fulfilling his promise to Thetis (1.523–30), or following up on the verdict of the scales (8.68–77), or if Hektor’s interpretation is right at all. Then Hektor recaps that the Achaians have built the wall (8.177–9 recaps 7.436–41), and he says he will beat the wall, set fire to the Achaian ships, and cut the Achaians down (8.180–3). Here the wall’s story arc emerges, as taking it down becomes the first of the two missions that Hektor (again) lays out for himself, which will create audience anticipation for the next several episodes’ action.

Hektor then talks to his horses; he gives their shared backstory when he reminds the horses that Andromache took good care of them (8.187–90).³⁸ This brings back audience investment in Hektor *as* Andromache’s husband, and might bring to mind their encounter in Book 6. But then Hektor creates anticipation for future beats when he gives himself another mission, additional to (and possibly contrary to) burning the ships (8.180–3):³⁹ to capture Nestor’s shield and Diomedes’ corselet, with the aim of sending the Achaians back out of Troy.⁴⁰ Hektor’s focus on Nestor and Diomedes naturally continues on the primary contest between the three men over the last several beats, while looking forward to a potential outcome of that contest. At the same time, Hektor adds character depth and brings in Andromache (and her father, slain king of a sacked city), adding further weight to his character’s past *and* to the future outcome of his fight with Nestor and Diomedes.

Hera/Zeus: 8.198–252

The beat switches audience alignment to Hera, who responds with anger at Hektor’s boast and tries to convince Poseidon to enter into battle with her to save the dying Achaians (8.198–207). Poseidon turns her down (8.198–211), implicitly giving Zeus’s earlier threats against divine intervention as a reason (8.7–27). The narrative increases the sense of threat to the Achaians as it cuts from the divine exchange back to the Achaians,⁴¹ penned in between the ditch and the ships, and then, zooming in again, to Hektor: ‘He pinned them in like fast Ares would, Priam’s Hektor, since Zeus gave him the glory.’ (εἶλει δὲ θεῶ ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηι/Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἶ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκε, 8.215f.) So the narrative confirms

that Zeus grants the glory to Hektor, confirming Nestor's (8.141) and Hektor's (8.175f.) earlier interpretations of Zeus's thunderbolts saying just that.

The narrative goes so far as to say that Hektor might have set the Achaian ships on fire right there and then had not Hera intervened, using the contrafactual to cut back to the goddess, now encouraging Agamemnon (8.217–19).⁴² Through these rapid cuts between characters, the narrative gives the impression of action without showing us much action at all, as it jumps between the arcs of Diomedes, Nestor, Hektor, Hera, Zeus, and now, Agamemnon. So at Hera's bid, Agamemnon exhorts the Achaians who ran away a few minutes ago (8.78f.; 8.97f.). Agamemnon's exhortation from the centre hopes to reach to the far camps of Aias or to those of Achilles (8.223–5) – no mention is made of Achilles' anger, or any special circumstances keeping him out of the fight. But Agamemnon does use the past to characterize Hektor, saying that when they were all at Lemnos, they each could have taken a hundred or two hundred Trojans (cf. Nestor 2.122–32), but now none of them can take on one Hektor, who will soon set fire to the ships (8.229–35; cf. 7.113f.). Both this look backwards to when the Achaians were dominant, and this look forwards to Hektor burning their ships, imply Achilles' absence as a pivot point. This builds further anticipation for the ships being set on fire and recalls Hektor's boast from a previous beat that he would do just that (8.180–3). Agamemnon then prays to Zeus, who takes pity on him, giving the Danaans new strength (8.236–52). The narrative provides an emotional justification for that change, giving the audience access to Zeus in his pity (8.245f.).

Battle: 8.253–334

As the battle continues, patterns emerge that keep the narrative dynamic, but only slowly moving forward; repetitions become rife.⁴³ The Trojans will get the upper hand; the Achaians will get the upper hand; the gods will influence which is which. Some characters will die, but they are not *important* characters.⁴⁴ They are red-shirts, designed to keep the stakes high *around* our primary characters, without the threat of losing anyone too primary this early in the epic. So once again, the narrative aligns the audience with the Achaians as they turn back into battle, encouraged by Zeus's sign (8.251f.). Diomedes leads them, but the narrative creates another mini-catalogue of Achaians that follow him: the Atreidai, the Aiantes, Idomeneus, Meriones, Eurypylos, and Teukros (8.253–67).⁴⁵ Amidst these reintroductions, the narrative follows Teukros in particular, who has hardly

appeared in the narrative so far (cf. 6.31). Teukros shoots his arrows and then retreats back behind the shield of his half-brother Aias (8.267–72), killing a series of men. Agamemnon praises him and says that he will reward the archer should he ever take Troy (8.286–91). But Teukros's response dismisses that prize, as he expresses his frustration at trying to hit Hektor this whole time. He has killed eight men, but he 'can't hit this raging dog' (τοῦτον δ' οὐ δύναμαι βαλέειν κύνα λυσοσητήρα, 8.299).⁴⁶ The narrative aligns the audience with Teukros, and Hektor seems far away. In fact, neither Agamemnon nor Teukros name Hektor. The audience must guess that this 'raging dog' is Hektor, and then must re-integrate this new aspect of Hektor's character into their impression of him.

Only the narrative names Hektor, as Teukros tries again to hit him with his arrow, twice (8.300f. = 8.309f.). The first miss hits Gorgythion, another son of Priam (so even more of a red-shirt stand-in for Hektor),⁴⁷ whose head goes limp to one side like a poppy's head falling over in the rain, when he dies (8.306). These extensive similes for the deaths of red-shirts make them real, make death seem that much closer to the characters that the audience has actually had time to invest in as their vivid visuality make them particularly impactful and memorable for the audience.⁴⁸ The second time Teukros tries to shoot Hektor, he hits Hektor's new charioteer, Archeptolemos (8.312), who, the audience might recall, became Hektor's charioteer after Diomedes killed Eniopeus (8.119–29). Once again the dreadful grief covers Hektor for his charioteer (8.124 = 8.316), but again he does not stop, rushing to find a replacement, this time Kebriones (8.318). Hektor himself jumps down from the chariot, grabs a huge rock and charges at Teukros, striking him so that his arm goes dead, he drops his bow, and his companions must carry him off the battlefield (8.328–34). This whole sequence of events perfectly demonstrates how the narrative holds Hektor in suspense. First, two red-shirts die in proximity to Hektor as Teukros strains to hit Hektor. Hektor strikes back and stops Teukros from shooting any more of his men, but does not kill him. The narrative keeps moving forward, but little changes: both Teukros and Hektor survive.

Overhaul-ish: 8.335–437

Teukros's men carry him out of the action (8.332–4), and the beat switches to Zeus, who once again intervenes and rouses the Trojans' battle-fury (μένος, 8.335): does this count as an overhaul? Is battle-fury excited? Or incited?⁴⁹ The earlier Teukros scene started to hint at an issue of recognizing Hektor, who raged

‘like a mad dog’ (8.299). Now Hektor rages in the vanguard, exulting in his strength (“Ἐκτωρ δ’ ἐν πρώτοισι κίε σθένει βλεμείνων, 8.337),⁵⁰ like a hunting dog snapping at a lion or a wild boar (8.338–42). He chases after the Achaians, ‘always killing the man trailing behind’ (αἰὲν ἀποκτείνων τὸν ὀπίσταντον, 8.342): Hektor’s killing is a continuing, repeated action, and its lack of detailed description sparks the imagination. In response, the Achaians ‘flee, afraid’ (οἱ δὲ φόβοντο, 8.342). They regroup beside the ships, praying to the gods and standing fast there (8.343–7). Then the narrative cuts back to Hektor, who now has the eyes of the Gorgon or mortal-plaguing Ares (8.348f.), as he pins the Achaians against the ships: this, too, suggests an overhaul. While the silent Hektor rages and looks like a Gorgon, the narrative challenges the audience’s character recognition, alignment, and allegiance with his character.

Hera ‘recognizes’ Hektor, calling him by name, reiterating his role as Priam’s son, but her evaluation of him asks for audience engagement:

οἳ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὄλωνται
 ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ῥίπῃ, ὃ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκέτ’ ἀνεκτῶς
 “Ἐκτωρ Πριαμίδης, καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε.

‘Must they then accomplish this evil fate and be destroyed,
 At the blow of one man, who rages, and can no longer be endured,
 Hektor the son of Priam, and he has done all these bad things.’

Hera to Athena, 8.354–56

Can the audience recognize the Hektor that Athena describes? ‘Raging’ (8.355), like Teukros’s raging dog? (8.299). Is he the same Hektor as before? The narrative says that Hektor kills, but does not give the names of his victims, does not spend the time on his kills: there is one line of his carnage (8.342). Just a couple of beats earlier, Teukros kills enough men that the narrator must ask who he killed and name them all (8.273–6). But even if the narrative has not shown Hektor’s kills in detail, Hera’s speech diegetically enhances Hektor’s current successes. Her saying that Hektor has done ‘many bad things’ is a callback to Aineias’s attempt to recognize Diomedes during his *aristeia* (5.175). Through Hera, Hektor seems more than he is, for a moment.

As Athena responds to Hera, she recalibrates the narrative’s recognition of Hektor, recapping knowledge about him that most audiences will already know: ‘And even this man will lose his battle-fury and his life, dying at the hands of the Argives in his own land’ (καὶ λίην οὗτός γε μένος θυμόν τ’ ὀλέσειε/ χερσὶν ὑπ’ Ἀργείων φθίμενος ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ, 8.358). Athena reasserts Hektor’s mortality, and looks forward once more to Hektor’s death: he is no Gorgon, he is not Ares

(cf. 8.348f.). He is the man whose wife told him that his battle-fury would kill him when the Achaians cut him down (cf. Andromache, 6.407–10). Athena explains Hektor's current strength with another recap, that Zeus only helps him out of obligation to Thetis (8.370–3 recaps 1.523–30). Athena then looks forward to a battlefield confrontation with Hektor, wondering as she readies to arm herself if Hektor will be happy to see her, or if some Trojan will be made a feast for the birds and the dogs (8.376–80). Her death threat explicitly eschews Hektor himself, aimed instead at 'the Trojans': he cannot die yet. The beat switches again as Zeus sees his daughter arming, and intervenes, reinforcing his earlier rules about non-intervention (8.7–27), and cutting off at the knees any threat Athena might have had for Hektor (8.397–437).

Hera/Zeus: 8.438–84

The scene follows Zeus back to Mount Olympos (8.438–43), where all the gods gather. Zeus recaps the previous beat by saying that Athena and Hera would have been sorry if he had struck their car down (8.447–56 recaps 8.409–24). In response, Hera asks that she be allowed at least to advise the Argives in order to protect them (8.466–8). Zeus refuses and threatens that tomorrow will be even worse for her beloved Achaians (8.470–2). This looks forward to future episodes, as Zeus creates a series of signpost events for Hera (and the audience) to follow:

οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμου ἀποπαύσεται ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ
 πρὶν ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα,
 ἤματι τῷ ὅτ' ἂν οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πρύμνησι μάχωνται
 στείνει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος·
 ὥς γὰρ θέσφατόν ἐστι·

'Strong Hektor won't stop fighting until
 swift-footed Peleus's son gets up, by the ships,
 on that day when they fight around their ships' prows,
 in dire straits over Patroklos's death.
 So that's the prophecy.'

Zeus to Hera, 8.473–7

Zeus's speech gives the strongest direction so far of where the story is going, conflating prophecy and *prolepsis*, or flash-forward.⁵¹ Zeus, too, teases a point of no return in looking forward to these deaths, explicitly for the first time within the *Iliad*. And in marking out 'tomorrow' as an even worse day for the Achaians (8.470–2), along with these prophecies, Zeus raises questions for the audience to

engage with, ‘will Patroklos die tomorrow?’ This would be quite a place to take a performance break, a proverbial ‘mic drop’ that resolves the problem of Hera’s interference (for now) that has dominated much of the previous beat sequences, and that builds intense anticipation for what will happen next to get us to Patroklos’s death.

Die another day: 8.485–9.88

As the next beat leaves the gods, the sun sets, and the narrative gives access both to the Trojan sadness at day’s end as well as the Achaians’ relief (8.485–8). Hektor calls an assembly, and the description of the place as littered with corpses creates a sharp reminder of the day’s carnage (8.489–91). Here the narrative takes time to re-introduce Hektor according to recognizable features after the now-finished ‘overhaul’: Zeus loves him (8.493; cf. 7.280) and he has his eleven-cubit spear (8.494f. = 6.319f.). Hektor’s speech recaps that nightfall has stopped their advance (8.499f. recapping 8.432–7) as he sets the Trojans on ‘missions’ to make a feast (8.504), and to take up their night watches, some here on the field (8.507–9), the old men and boys on the wall (8.517–19), the women in their homes (8.520–2). Hektor suggests that the women’s night fires can guard against a night-time sneak attack in the city (8.522): this might delight the traditional audience, familiar with the story of the Trojan horse.⁵² Then Hektor prays to Zeus that the Trojans can drive out the Achaians (8.526–8). Finally, Hektor reinforces Diomedes as the premier warrior on the battlefield, when he says that in the morning he will take him on and kill him (8.532–8). It has been around a half hour since Diomedes rescued Nestor and thought of attacking Hektor three times back at 8.169–72, with one other reminder of his pre-eminence since (8.254–7). Hektor’s emphasis on ‘tomorrow’ as he imagines taking on Diomedes (8.535, 8.538, 8.341) builds strongly on Zeus’s prophecy (8.470) to create audience anticipation for what will happen next.

The next beat shows the Trojans completing the ‘missions’ that Hektor laid out for them in the previous beat. But as the Trojans make their sacrifices, the gods reject them from their hate for Troy (8.548–52). The narrative identified Hektor through Zeus’s love for him just a few minutes earlier (8.493), but now (8.548–52), it shows again how the gods hate Troy (cf. 4.31–6; 6.311). These conflicting emotions between the gods, which wreaked so much havoc in the last battle sequence, create continuing ambiguity as the narrative moves forward. So the audience wants to see, ‘what will happen tomorrow?’

The day's end, the recap 'so the Trojans had watches' (ὥς οἱ μὲν Τρῶες φυλακὰς ἔχον, 9.1), and the alignment switch to the Achaians suggest that a performer could take a break between books, but certainly does not have to. This next beat sequence takes place almost entirely among the Achaians, and, despite Hektor's impact on the battle in the previous sequence, the Achaians do not mention him now. Except for Achilles. And the fact that only Achilles mentions Hektor throughout the embassy scene, imagining past and future confrontations with Hektor, begins to prepare the audience for that final confrontation, set up as it has been by Zeus (8.473–7).

Full of sorrow, Agamemnon addresses the Achaian assembly. Here he picks up on the divine ambiguity that so defined the action of the previous 'episode', saying that Zeus has lied when he said that Agamemnon would sack Ilion, but acts like he wanted them all to leave Troy (9.18–25). Diomedes then chastises Agamemnon for wanting to leave, claiming that he and Sthenelos alone would stay and sack the city (9.30–49). Nestor makes peace between them, and recaps the significant fact of the Trojans' guard fires and their proximity to the ships (9.76f. recaps 8.553–65). As the assembly breaks up, the narrative, too, recaps important spatial information, as the Achaian heroes (named as Thrasymedes, Askalaphos, Ialmenos, Meriones, Aphareus, Deïpyros, Lykomedes) set their garrisons 'between the ditch and the wall' (μέσον τάφρου καὶ τείχεος, 9.87; cf. 7.435–41), reiterating the landmarks that will gain further prominence in future battle sequences. A performer might break here, too, as opposed to the book break, as this settles the Achaians in for the night.

Embassy: 9.89–713

The next beat follows Agamemnon and the other leaders to his tent, where he feeds them. Here, Nestor brings up the quarrel that Agamemnon had with Achilles in the first episode (9.106–11 recaps 1.120–305), suggesting that they might try to make amends with him (9.111–3). This sets up the 'mission' for the next beats, and defines the problem of this possible episode. Agamemnon sends an embassy to Achilles, where Odysseus, Aias, and Phoinix head to Achilles' tent with Agamemnon's offer of restitution. The narrative *shows* us Achilles for the first time now since we left him by his ships, almost six hours ago in performance time, more with breaks (1.492; cf. 2.685–8). Odysseus makes the proposal, which Achilles refuses: Odysseus explicitly mentions that Achilles might win great glory in killing Hektor as a reason that he should return (9.300–7), even if he

does not accept Agamemnon's gifts. And even though Achilles has been absent, Achilles recaps Hektor's success in the recent battle. Achilles knows that there has been a threat of fire to the ships (9.347; cf. 8.229) and he knows that the Achaians have built a ditch (9.349f. recaps 7.435–41). Achilles also knows that the Achaian efforts to hold Hektor back have not been entirely successful (9.351f.). Then Achilles recounts his own successes in fighting Hektor – these happened before the narrative of the *Iliad* began, giving depth to the enemies' relationship, and creating further audience anticipation for their future confrontation. When Achilles was fighting, he says, Hektor never came out beyond the Skaian gates and the oak tree (9.354; cf. Agamemnon at 8.229–35) and there was this one time when they came face-to-face and Hektor barely escaped with his life (9.355). So Achilles implies that *he* is the only one who can actually stop Hektor (cf. 1.241–4), but also says that he does not want to fight him now (9.356–63). This short passage confirms, from another perspective, Zeus's prophecy that Hektor will rage until Achilles returns to battle (8.473–6).

Achilles' speech also recaps the rupture between Agamemnon and himself once again before he rejects all of Agamemnon's proffered gifts, asking how material possessions can compare to the value of his life (9.400–18). Finally, he says that the Achaians should count on something other than him to rescue their ships (9.423). Phoinix's response also recaps and anticipates the risk of fire to the ships (9.436; cf. 9.347, 8.229) before he his own long history and the story of Meleagros. But Phoinix, like Odysseus, cannot convince Achilles. Finally Aias speaks, saying that Achilles does not remember the affection of his friends (9.630f.); but this 'memory' cannot compete, Achilles says, with his memory of what happened with Agamemnon (9.646f.).⁵³ Here, the audience might naturally find more allegiance with Achilles, since they share the memory of his quarrel with Agamemnon, more than any memory of relationships that he had with the Achaians before that incident, before the *Iliad* began.

Achilles then says that he will not return to battle until Hektor comes all the way to the ships of the Myrmidons, killing Achaians, setting fire to their ships (9.650–4), again recapping Zeus's prophecy (8.473–6). And Achilles boasts that he will be the one to hold Hektor back, eager as he is for battle (9.654f.), backing up his boast of nearly killing Hektor in the past in his earlier speech (9.354f.). Achilles' speeches, like Zeus's prophecy in the prior book, draw an event roadmap that the audience now anticipates;⁵⁴ this builds further on the *Iliad*'s melodramatic alignment structure in drawing our attention to gaps of knowledge. Achilles might know that he will be the one to stop Hektor, but he makes no mention of Patroklos's death (cf. Zeus at 8.475–7). This gap in the knowledge between Zeus,

the narrator, and the audience increases emotional investment and anticipation of the events to come. Achilles' omission invites the audience to consider where Patroklos's death will fit into that map. In the next scene, Patroklos is present as he orders a bed made up for Phoinix and then heads to sleep himself, in Achilles' tent, with a woman whom Achilles gifted to him (9.658–68). Achilles' ignorance of Patroklos's death is so followed by an emphatic scene of the intimacy between Achilles and Patroklos.

The embassy 'episode' deepens characters through backstory and conversation, and reasserts Achilles as a main character after an absence of many episodes. Achilles' reintroduction also drastically builds anticipation for his eventual return to battle and his final confrontation with Hektor. But it does not move the plot forward in itself.

Spy vs Spy: 10.1–579

With the embassy problem 'resolved' in Achilles' refusal to return, and the beginning of Book 10 recapping key bits of information from Book 8 and 9, a performer could definitely take a break between Books 9 and 10.⁵⁵ With Book 9's mission, the embassy, failing, the battle results from the sequences in Book 8 stand unchanged, and the constant references to the corpses on the ground throughout Book 10 literally set its actions in that battle's aftermath (cf. 8.489–91).⁵⁶ More, it means that the Achaians still feel beat, and so consider leaving Troy altogether (in yet another Agamemnon-sponsored appeal to abandon the war), before setting a different mission to find out whether or not the Trojans will remain camped out on the plain or if they will return to the city now that they are winning (10.204–10). The narrative similarly shows the Trojans wondering if the Achaians will leave, now that they have been 'beaten down beneath (the Trojans') hands', as Hektor says (ἤδη χεیرهσσιν ὕφ' ἡμετέρησι δαμέντες, 10.310). So the thrust of the 'episode' is in these night missions, this spy versus spy.⁵⁷

In the first beats of this sequence, the sleepless Agamemnon gazes out at the many Trojan fires (10.11–3), recapping the narrative's long description of the fires from 8.553–63.⁵⁸ Menelaos cannot sleep, either, and the narrative reminds us again here that he worries over the Argives who came on this expedition for his sake (10.26–8). When the two men meet each other, Menelaos asks Agamemnon if he is putting on his armour in order to set a mission for one of the Achaians to go spy on the Trojans, which plants the seeds for the mission that

Agamemnon will in fact set (10.37–41). Agamemnon’s response to Menelaos recaps much of Book 8, including where the narrative left Hektor. First, Agamemnon tells us that ‘Zeus’s mind changed; now he pays more attention to Hektor’s offerings’ (ἐπει Διὸς ἐτράπετο φρήν./Ἐκτορέοις ἄρα μᾶλλον ἐπὶ φρένα θῆχ’ ἱεροῖσιν, 10.45f.). Then he goes on to describe Hektor himself:

οὐ γάρ πω ἰδόμεν, οὐδ’ ἔκλυον ἀυδήσαντος
 ἄνδρ’ ἕνα τοσσάδε μέμμερ’ ἐπ’ ἡματι μητίσασθαι,
 ὅσσ’ Ἐκτωρ ἔρρεξε Διὶ φίλος υἱας Ἀχαιῶν
 αὐτως, οὔτε θεᾶς υἱὸς φίλος οὔτε θεοῖο.
 ἔργα δ’ ἔρεξ’ ὅσα φημὶ μελησέμεν Ἀργείοισι
 δηθά τε καὶ δολιχόν. τόσα γὰρ κακὰ μῆσατ’ Ἀχαιοῦς.
 Ἰ’ve never seen, never even heard someone talk about
 one man planning so many atrocities on one day –
 as many as Hektor, “loved by Zeus”, has done against the Achaians’ sons,
 just like that, even though he’s not the son of a goddess, or a god.
 He’s done such things . . . I think they’ll weigh on the Argives
 for a long, long time. So violent are the things he’s planned against the
 Achaians.’

Agamemnon to Menelaos, 10.47–50

Agamemnon’s view of Hektor recalls Hera’s assessment from the last battle, when she said Hektor ‘had done many bad things’ (καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε, 8.356). He paints the battle sequence in Book 8 as the worst in Achaian history and elevates Hektor as the most fearful warrior that the world has ever seen. This compels any audience to weigh Agamemnon’s experience of Book 8’s battle sequences against their own. There is also a hint of the metapoetic in Agamemnon’s notion that Hektor’s deeds will weigh on the Achaians for a long time to come, not just this hour or so of performance time since they happened. Agamemnon is, after all, still voicing this pain here in the twenty-first century.

In the next beat, Agamemnon heads to the tent of Nestor, where, after hearing Agamemnon’s concerns, Nestor tries to comfort him. Nestor’s reassurance also focuses on Hektor, like Agamemnon’s speech from the previous scene:⁵⁹

οὐ θην Ἐκτορι πάντα νοήματα μητίετα Ζεὺς
 ἐκτελέει, ὅσα πού νυν ἐέλπεται· ἀλλὰ μιν οἴω
 κήδεσι μοχθήσειν καὶ πλείοσιν, εἴ κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς
 ἐκ χόλου ἀργαλέοιο μεταστρέψη φίλον ἦτορ.
 ‘Come on, the master-planner Zeus won’t let Hektor
 do everything he hopes to do . . . But I think

he'll have even worse things to worry about, if Achilles
ever turns his heart away from his savage anger.'

Nestor to Agamemnon, 10.104–7

Nestor's response to Agamemnon recaps the possibility of Achilles' return and his eventual confrontation with Hektor, further building up audience anticipation of those events (cf. 2.694, 8.473–6; 9.650–5). But Nestor also draws attention to Zeus's split allegiances within the narrative, which, in some way, mirror the audience's own: we know that Zeus is helping Hektor now (cf. 8.161, 8.175f.), but we also know (as Nestor suggests), that Zeus will not help Hektor forever (cf. 8.473–6).

In the next beat, Nestor arms and joins Agamemnon and Menelaos, followed by Odysseus and Diomedes and the men make their way to a spot that mirrors the place where Hektor held his assembly, where the ground was clear of corpses (10.199–201 recaps 8.489–91), again recalling the day's battle. Nestor finally states the mission, to find out if the Trojans will go back in the city or stay out on the field (10.208–10 recaps 10.40f.), recapping again that the Trojans 'beat the Achaians' in the day's battle (10.210 recaps 8.344).

The assembly chooses Diomedes and Odysseus for the night scouting mission, and the next scene shows the men arming for their scouting mission, and an exchange with Athena, that includes both a night-time bird-sign and a prayer (10.218–98). The narrative then paints an ominous tone as it sets the scene they make their way through, again, the aftermath of Book 8's battle sequences: 'the black night and the gore, and the corpses, and the armour, and the black blood' (διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν/ ἄμ φόνον, ἄν νέκυας, διὰ τ' ἔντευα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα, 10.297f.). This line significantly precedes the narrative's reintroduction of Hektor in the next beat, linking the idea of mortal threat to Hektor.

In the next beat the narrative aligns the audience with Hektor, in the middle of his Trojan assembly.⁶⁰ Hektor has also called a midnight counsel, and the audience must assume, based solely on their experience of the previous beat sequence, that the Trojans, too, want to send out a scouting mission when we hear his first line: 'Who'll promise to do this thing for me, for a great reward?' (τίς κέν μοι τόδε ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσειε/ δῶρω ἔπι μεγάλῳ, 10.303f.) Hektor finally explains the mission at the end of his speech (10.307–12). Hektor's mission also responds to the battle in Book 8, as he needs a spy to discover if the Achaians will finally leave or if they will keep fighting now that they have been beaten 'beneath our hands'? (ἤδη χεῖρεσσιν ὑφ' ἡμετέρησι δαμέντες, 10.310; cf. 10.210, 8.344).

The narrative takes time to introduce Dolon, a new character (10.314–18), as he comes forward and agrees to Hektor's mission. A new character volunteering for a mission is a red-shirt move: if we have never seen him before and he is going to do something dangerous, he is probably going to die, especially as we already know that the other side is sending Odysseus and Diomedes, two well-established characters. Dolon asks Hektor to swear on his sceptre that he will give Achilles' horses to him should he complete the task (10.319–27). Dolon asks Hektor for something that he does not have, but the connection between Hektor and Achilles' horses is a detail significant to future episodes. Dolon assumes that the Achaians will be gathered at Agamemnon's ship, pondering their retreat (10.326f.): the audience knows that he is wrong, as they were, in fact, outside the ditch, getting a spy mission ready (10.194–202), but earlier in this same evening, the Achaians were pondering their retreat (9.26–8).

Hektor accepts Dolon's proposal and swears to it (10.328–31), but as he cannot actually *swear* to give something that he does not have, the narrative comments on Hektor's assent to the oath: 'So he spoke, and swore a foresworn oath, and urged (Dolon) on' (ὥς φάτο καί ῥ' ἐπίορκον ἀπώμοσε, τὸν δ' ὀρόθουνεν, 10.332).⁶¹ It is difficult to say whether or not the narrative tries to affect allegiance here, if this is a judgement on Hektor as an oath-taker, or if it is instead on the impossibility of the oath sworn ever being fulfilled. If it is the former, it plays on Book 3 and Book 7 in Hektor's relationships to oaths, and his status as an oath-breaker, through his association first with Paris and then with Pandaros (cf. 3.106; 7.69–72). If it is the latter, then this narrative comment elicits an audience curiosity as to whether the impossibility of the sworn oath comes from the fact that Hektor does not have the horses to give, or the fact that Dolon will not live to complete his mission. This small narrative intervention opens up a bundle of potential, asking us to look both backwards and forwards in considering our interpretation of the scene, and of Hektor himself. Is this Hektor the same man that the Achaians have made him out to be? The previous beats in the Achaian camp do more in the construction of Hektor than this one scene where Hektor himself appears. Is this the Hektor that we have seen before? Nearly as quickly as he appears, he disappears again. And before Dolon even makes it out of camp, the narrator tells us 'he wasn't going to return from the ships to bring back some story for Hektor' (οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν/ ἔλθῶν ἐκ νηῶν ἄψ' Ἑκτορι μῦθον ἀποισεῖν. 10.336f.).⁶² Dolon's red-shirt status is sealed.

The narrator keeps the audience attached to Dolon as he leaves camp, but switches almost immediately, mid-line, to Odysseus spotting him (10.339).⁶³ Here, the *Iliad* again exploits its melodramatic alignment structure. Dolon hears

someone coming after him, but, in another tragic moment of his ignorance compared to knowledge that the audience and the narrator have, he thinks Hektor has sent someone out after him (10.356). When Diomedes and Odysseus capture Dolon, just a short time later, they ask him if it was Hektor who sent him out to spy on them (10.388), which both recaps the previous scene and perhaps reinforces Hektor's role as the mastermind that Agamemnon made him out to be (10.49f.). Dolon claims that 'Hektor led my mind aside with many delusions' (πολλῆσιν μ' ἄτησι παρέκ νόον ἤγαγεν Ἐκτωρ, 10.390). Dolon's claim invites the audience to judge Hektor again, playing on the ambiguity over Hektor's oath in the previous scene: did Hektor do something wrong in promising Achilles' horses to Dolon? Did he actually lead Dolon's mind astray? The two Achaians ask Dolon where Hektor is now (10.406–8), and finally get to their mission, asking whether or not the Trojans are debating staying near the ships or returning to the city (10.409–11; cf. 10.208–10). Dolon immediately tells them where Hektor is (10.414–16), but does not answer whether or not the Trojans will return to Troy, instead recapping once again the fires (10.418–22 recaps 8.8.517–22, 8.553–63). Then Diomedes and Odysseus ask about the Trojans' sleeping arrangements, and Dolon tells them, introducing Rhesus, who is a Thracian king and another red-shirt (10.423–45).

Diomedes mercilessly kills Dolon, throwing his supplication, his cooperation and their promises of safety, all down to the ground with Dolon's tumbling, still-speaking head (10.457). The Thracians suffer a similarly brutal fate, slashed through in their sleep by the Achaian pair, twelve in all, predictably including Rhesus, their leader (10.469–97). As Diomedes and Odysseus flee the scene, they reach the space 'where they killed Hektor's scout' (ὄθι σκοπὸν Ἐκτορος ἔκταν, 10.526). This last mention of Hektor omits Dolon's name altogether, as he becomes a mere extension of Hektor. Hektor's many mentions in these beats, between Diomedes, Odysseus, and Dolon, and coming out of the carnage of the Thracian massacre, make him a centre around which death dances. The first part of the episode, with Agamemnon's extreme characterization of Hektor as the most heinous hero alive sets this up. But once again, the narrative shows us little of Hektor himself. He is constantly refracted through the eyes of others.

In the end, both missions fail, in that no one has more knowledge about what will happen next. But the episode has succeeded in giving the Achaians more depth, and in creating Hektor as more of an enemy. Diomedes and Odysseus wash off their battle-filth, take baths, sit down to eat, and make their offerings to Athena (10.572–9). And with the long, anxious night finally over, a new day begins.

All day permanent red: 11.1–162

As dawn breaks after the night of spying missions and slaughtered Thracians, the narrative plunges us back into full-out battle once again. As none of the night's events moved the narrative forward, the narrator does not need to recap any of them here, except that the wall and ditch remain focal points for the action.⁶⁴ The night's embassy to Achilles and the night raids have taken up an hour and a half of performance time, plus a possible break between those episodes. But now we embark on the longest battle in the epic, and it will last, literally, for hours, over many 'episodes'. The day's battle, stretching from this dawn to the night that sets in the middle of Book 18 (over six and a half hours of performance time without breaks), is the 'tomorrow' that Zeus predicted would be an even worse day for the Achaians (8.470–2).

The *Iliad* carefully breaks up this large chunk of battle, to continue to build up to major events. Here is where the *Iliad*'s huge cast of characters helps create continuous dynamism in a plot that has only one major problem resolution in the next several hours: Hektor's breaking through the Achaian ramparts at the end of the battle sequence in Book 12.⁶⁵ With visits to the periphery of battle, like when Meriones has to go and find a new spear in Book 11, or when Patroklos helps the wounded Eurypylos in Books 11 and 15, or visits to the gods, particularly in the extended scene of Hera's seduction of Zeus in Book 14, the narrative keeps audience engagement primarily through character interaction and deepening. In Book 8's battle sequence there was a clear pattern of Achaian success, divine intervention, Trojan success, divine intervention, with the main characters of Diomedes, Nestor, Teukros, and Agamemnon on the Achaian side, and Hektor and his red-shirt charioteers on the Trojan side. But that battle-day lasted just over a half hour of performance time. Even the longer battle that stretches across Books 4, 5, and 6 and 7 only lasts around two hours, and it, too, has extensive breaks with the *theomachia* (the battle between the gods, 5.711–909) and Hektor's visit to Troy (6.237–7.3). With the battle to come being so much more extensive, the narrative must engage more diverse strategies and a much broader range of characters that each have distinct arcs that the narrative follows through the fight.

As dawn breaks, Hate stirs up the Achaians, significantly from Odysseus's ship, the centre of the Achaians' ships-line that stretches from Aias's at one end to Achilles' at another (11.4–14); like the earlier reference to this layout, no mention is made of Achilles' absence from the fighting (cf. 8.223–5). While this recaps the layout of the Achaian camp, the reiteration of the ditch (11.49; cf. 9.87,

7.435–41) and the Trojans on the other side, ‘on the ground rising from the plain’ (11.56; cf. 10.160) contributes to our understanding the space within which the following battle will occur.⁶⁶ Agamemnon is the first Achaian to arm, in an elaborate scene that takes up twenty-seven lines (11.17–44).⁶⁷ The narrative aligns the audience with Agamemnon, giving them plenty of time to spend with him with the length and vividness of this description, which is full of colour and life (cobalt snakes, Gorgon head, etc.). Hera and Athena are also on his side (11.45f.).⁶⁸ As with the last battle, the narrative then moves across the ditch to the Trojan side, marking them as antagonists. Here, a Trojan micro-catalogue marks out which characters will be important in the coming fight:⁶⁹ Hektor, Poulydamas, Aineias, Antenor, Polybos, Agenor, Akamas (11.57–60). This is the first appearance of Poulydamas, who will play a significant role in the next several hours of action. After this catalogue, the narrative returns to Hektor: his shield shines like a star as he moves from the vanguard to the rear flank, back and forth (11.61–6). This focus on Hektor seemingly sets him up as the primary antagonist against Agamemnon’s protagonist in the battle to come.⁷⁰

In the next beat, the narrative zooms out to show the whole field (11.67–73),⁷¹ before following the gaze of Hate (11.73–5) to shift to the gods, all of whom are mad at Zeus for helping the Trojans (11.75–9); this creates continuity for Zeus from his role in Book 8. The narrator aligns with Zeus, through his not caring about the other gods as he settles in to watch the fight (11.79–83). For the whole morning, men die (11.84–91), until the Danaans, Agamemnon first, finally break through (11.91), with Hektor, Agamemnon’s expected antagonist, nowhere to be seen (cf. 11.56–66).

In the next beats, Agamemnon has a killing spree that provides many glimpses of character background stories and recaps of past scenes. First Agamemnon kills Priam’s sons Isos and Antiphos, whom Achilles had before captured and ransomed (11.101–12). This makes a clear contrast between the absent Achilles and Agamemnon, and between the narrative time and the time that came before the *Iliad*. Next he kills Antimachos’s sons Peisandros and Hippolochos, who had taken Paris’s bribe to oppose returning Helen (11.121–5). This also refers to Paris’s initial crime, which precedes the epic, while elaborating on the Trojan assembly that decided against returning Helen (7.345–80). Their supplication reveals their lineage to Agamemnon, who gives further backstory, saying that their father Antimachos had plotted to kill Menelaos (11.138–42). These ‘memories’ give the audience access to Agamemnon, and perhaps justify Agamemnon killing them both (11.143–7): the scene certainly opens Agamemnon up for the audience to consider their allegiance to him.

Mid-line, the beat shifts to show all the Achaians running after the Trojans, before coming back to Agamemnon cutting men down (11.149–54). Then the narrative switches attachment through a simile.⁷² The simile begins in such a way that the narrative still seems to follow Agamemnon, comparing him to a forest fire; but it soon changes, so that the comparison is actually between the brush uprooted by the forest fire and the heads of Trojans (11.155–9). In response to these uprooted heads, the narrative switches to the horses driving now-empty chariots, longing for their missing charioteers, who lie dead to the delight of vultures rather than their wives (11.59–63). This shift creates allegiance with the Trojans as much as with Agamemnon, and once again draws the audience's attention to the real stakes of the battlefield, and the emotional consequences that these deaths hold.

Hektor rising: 11.163–368

In the next beat sequence, Agamemnon continues his rampage, and Zeus must rescue Hektor, dragging him out of the carnage (11.163–5).⁷³ Zeus's rare battlefield intervention here establishes his special relationship with Hektor that in turn invites audience allegiance; at the same time, this move fits with Zeus's earlier prediction of Hektor's glory (cf. 8.470–7). In Hektor's absence, Agamemnon kills a series of Trojan heroes (11.175–82). When Agamemnon nearly reaches the very walls of Troy, Zeus intervenes again (11.181–4), giving Iris a message to take down and repeat to Hektor: he must stay out of the fighting until Agamemnon leaves, but then Zeus will grant him the glory for the rest of the day (11.186–94). The beat juxtaposition between Agamemnon's direct threat to the city in one beat (especially 11.175–82), and Zeus's call to Hektor in the next (11.182–94), again links the fates of Hektor and Troy, characterizing Hektor as Troy's defender, but just as vulnerable as Priam's city. But at the same time, Zeus's message removes Hektor from the battlefield for the next beat sequence, and so defies any expectation of a confrontation between Hektor and Agamemnon that the previous beats created.⁷⁴

Then Iris descends from Ida and repeats this message to Hektor.⁷⁵ Like Helenos before her, Iris calls Hektor 'equal of counsel' to Zeus's (Δὴ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντε, 11.200=7.47), here as a possible riff on Agamemnon's characterization of Hektor at 10.48 (μητίσασθαι). This character attribute for Hektor will show itself to be problematic as the narrative continues. Iris tells Hektor to urge the rest of his men on in the fight, but stay out of battle himself until Agamemnon

leaves the field wounded, pointing to an event in a future beat (11.206f.). This might be a narrative callback to Book 6, where Hektor exhorts his men to keep fighting as he goes on his mission to Troy (6.87–115), which denied an anticipated confrontation between an Achaian (there Diomedes) and Hektor.

Iris then says that Zeus will grant Hektor the glory until he reaches the ships, until sundown (11.207–9). So once again the *Iliad* exploits its melodramatic alignment structure. Now Hektor has information that the gods and the narrator and the audience already have: that this day will be bad for the Achaians (8.470–3) and that Hektor will reach the ships (8.475). But Zeus's message only partially relays the future he revealed in Book 8, as the message here says nothing about the death of Patroklos (cf. 8.476), nothing about Achilles' return (cf. 2.694; 8.474; 9.650–5). These gaps in Hektor's knowledge will influence his decisions over the next episodes, and the difference between *our* knowledge and *his* knowledge will create him as a more pathetic character. Hektor obeys Iris and jumps out of his chariot and runs along the ranks, stirring on his men (11.210–3).

The next beat switches audience alignment back to Agamemnon, giving him another few minutes of glory as he kills Iphidamas, only to be wounded by Koön, Iphidamas's brother, before he kills Koön, too (11.216–63). After this death, his wound hurts enough to drive him off the battlefield, making room for Hektor (11.267–79), fulfilling Iris's prediction that Agamemnon would leave the field, wounded (11.206f.). In the next beat, Hektor sees Agamemnon leaving and calls out to his troops, recapping that 'Zeus has granted (him) great glory' (ἐμοὶ δὲ μέγ' εὖχος ἔδωκε, 11.288 recaps 11.206–9, 11.192–5), finally fulfilling the expectation that Hektor will dominate on the battlefield. After stirring up his men, Hektor jumps into battle like a huntsman (the Trojans his hounds, 11.291–5) and like a squall on the wide sea (11.296–8). The narrator asks not just who was the first one that Hektor killed, but also who the last was, implying a longer list to come than what we saw with Agamemnon in the last beats (11.299). But this is a ploy; the narrator does not spend nearly as much time on Hektor's kills as he had on Agamemnon's in the previous scenes (11.91–159; 11.172–80). Instead, they are a virtuosic list for the narrator, as Hektor takes out ten named men in three lines. Again, the narrator compares Hektor to a whirlwind on the sea, striking the heads of men like so many waves (11.305–10).

The next beat emerges through a pivotal contrafactual,⁷⁶ which says that the Achaians might have fallen into their ships, if Odysseus had not cried out to Diomedes (11.310–19).⁷⁷ This contrafactual stands out because Zeus has prophesied that Hektor *will* reach the ships (8.475) and Hektor does now have the glory (11.200–9), so the narrator explicitly tells his audience 'not yet'.⁷⁸ More,

switching alignments away from Hektor once again upsets audience expectations of Hektor enacting his Zeus-given glory.⁷⁹ Seeing Hektor, Odysseus shouts out to Diomedes first, in a callback to the warriors' night-raid pairing in the sequences in Book 10. He tells Diomedes that there will be shame if Hektor takes their ships (11.313–5);⁸⁰ Diomedes answers that he will help him fight, but tells him, 'our pleasure won't last long, since cloud-gatherer Zeus wants to give power to the Trojans, instead of us' (ἀλλὰ μίνυνθα/ ἡμέων ἔσσειται ἦδος, ἐπεὶ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς/ Τρωσὶν δὴ βόλεται δοῦναι κράτος ἢ ἐπερ ἡμῖν, 11.317–19). Diomedes' speech here is a callback to his perceptions of divine intervention in earlier battle scenes (cf. 5.601–6), as well as Nestor's speech to him in the last long battle sequence, when Zeus there, too, was giving the glory to Hektor (8.139–44).

The narrative keeps the audience attached to Diomedes and Odysseus as they rush into battle, with Diomedes instantly killing Thymbraios (11.320), while Odysseus kills Molion (11.322). Then the two charge, 'so the Achaians had a welcome breather after they'd fled from brilliant Hektor' (αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ/ ἀσπασίως φεύγοντες ἀνέπνεον Ἴκτορα δῖον. 11.326f.). This provides another recap of Hektor's dominance, with the audience now aligned with the Achaians. The narrator keeps the audience attached to the pair as Diomedes kills the sons of Merops and Odysseus kills Hyperiochos and Hippodamas (11.328–35).

The scene changes again to Zeus on Mount Ida, who, watching the battle, 'now lays the fight out equally; so they killed each other' (ἔνθ' ἄσφιν κατὰ ἴσα μάχην ἐτάνυσσε Κρονίων/ ἔξ' Ἰδῆς καθορῶν· τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλους ἐνάριζον. 11.336f.). The narrative updates us with new information, but Hektor does not get the memo that Zeus, for now, is no longer entirely honouring the glory that he promised at 11.200–9. This small piece of information serves as an explanation for Odysseus's and Diomedes' success, but it also creates another gap between what we know and what Hektor knows, and that gap builds anticipation for how Hektor's ignorance will affect him. Cutting back to the battle, Diomedes kills Agastrophos (11.338–42).

The beat switches again as Hektor sees this kill from across the battlefield, and charges Diomedes and Odysseus (11.343f.). The narrative instantly switches audience alignment back to Diomedes and Odysseus, giving access to Diomedes as he shivers, seeing Hektor, and calls on Odysseus that they should stand their ground, as 'this pain – mighty Hektor – whirls towards us' (νῶϊν δὴ τόδε πῆμα κλίνδεται ὄβριμος Ἴκτωρ, 11.347). Then Diomedes throws his spear, and hits Hektor's helmet, which we learn was given to him by Apollo (11.349–53). Now the narrative attaches the audience to Hektor as he runs into the crowd of his people, takes a knee, and almost loses consciousness (11.354–6), as 'black night

covered his two eyes' (ἀμφὶ δὲ ὄσσε κελαινὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψε, 11.356). This formula ambiguously implies death or near-death, driving home that this was a close one.⁸¹ While Diomedes goes to retrieve his spear, Hektor recovers and manages to get back on his chariot and manoeuvre it out of the fray again (11.356–60): this rapid alignment switch between both men keeps the audience's interest piqued in both.⁸² Here, again, the narrator says that Hektor 'dodged dark death' (ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν, 11.360). Hektor's near death shows the direct results of Zeus's intervention from the previous beat (11.336f.). Diomedes shouts out after Hektor and reinforces this: 'now you escaped death again' (ἔξ αὖ νῦν ἔφυγες θάνατον, 11.362), which also calls back to Zeus saving Hektor against Agamemnon (11.163–5). Then Diomedes claims that Apollo saved Hektor and that next time they fight, he will win (11.361–7). Diomedes' accusation does not reflect what happened: Apollo did not save Hektor, but the spear did bounce off of a helmet that we have now learned came from Apollo (11.353). This slight discrepancy asks if Diomedes too quickly dismisses Hektor, or if Hektor has too much of a reputation of being rescued by Apollo. Whatever the audience decides in determining their allegiance, Diomedes has cut short the glory that Zeus just promised Hektor ten minutes ago (11.200–9) and finally set into action just a few minutes ago (11.284f.), disappointing the audience's expectation that this would be Hektor's time to shine.⁸³

Injuries: 11.369–488

But it was also Diomedes who said that his and Odysseus's pleasure would be short-lived (11.315f.). As Diomedes starts stripping the body of Agastrophos (11.369 recaps his kill at 11.338), the narrative switches attachment to Paris, following his gaze that watches Diomedes. He shoots Diomedes in the foot, immediately wishing aloud that he had hit a more vital part of the Achaian hero (11.369–83). Diomedes responds to Paris with a series of insults that reinforce Hektor's own from many hours ago (11.385–90; cf. 3.39–57). But Diomedes leaves the battlefield just the same (11.399f.), so that Odysseus ponders taking on the Trojans by himself. He claims to be alone 'since Kronos's son forced the others Danaans to flee' (τοὺς δ' ἄλλους Δαναοὺς ἐφόβησε Κρονίων, 11.406); this recaps Hektor's chasing the Achaians three scenes ago, from 11.291–311 while opening up possibilities for what will happen next.

The Trojans descend on Odysseus before he can decide (11.411), but he kills Deïopites, Thoön, Ennomos, Chersidamas, Charops in quick order (11.420–7),

and finally Sokos, who wounds Odysseus. Athena stops the wound from being mortal (11.437f.), but the audience's attachment switches briefly to the Trojans who surge against him when they see that he is injured (11.459f.), before cutting back to Odysseus crying to his companions (11.461). Menelaos and Aias come to his aid and Menelaos leads Odysseus off the battlefield (11.463–88). This series of beats began with Agamemnon leaving the field, injured (11.264–74), then Hektor leaving the battlefield, injured (11.354–6), then Diomedes leaving the field, injured (11.396–400), and finally, here, Odysseus leaves (11.463–88). This narrative pattern keeps the audience more closely aligned with the Achaians so far, on this, Hektor's 'glory day'. But in placing Hektor's injury in with these others, it demands less judgement for it, in terms of audience allegiance: this battle results in injuries for many, and many of these heroes, unlike Hektor, will not come back into the fray.

Hektor returns: 11.489–594

With Menelaos leading Odysseus to safety (11.463–88), the beat switches to Aias, and he, too, kills a number of men: Dorkylos (Priam's illegitimate son), Pandokos, Lysandros, Pyrasos, Pylartes (11.489–96). But using its melodramatic alignment structure, the narrative tells us that Hektor had not heard about these deaths, because he is fighting on the left flank (11.497–9),⁸⁴ near Nestor and Idomeneus (11.501), wasting phalanxes of young men (νέων δ' ἀλάπαξε φάλαγγας, 11.503). When the narrative last left Hektor, he was running away, having barely recovered from Diomedes' spear to his helmet (11.359f.). That was just over ten minutes ago, and by finding Hektor somewhere else on the battlefield now, the narrative creates the illusion of a continuous Hektor who ran away only to resume fighting while our gaze has been on these Achaians. Even with Hektor's hard fighting, the narrative says that the Achaians only falter because of Paris's striking the healer Machaon (11.504–7):⁸⁵ Idomeneus asks Nestor to get Machaon off the battlefield in response (11.510–15), in yet another injury-based exit.

The scene shifts again, following the gaze of the Trojan Kebriones, Hektor's charioteer, who spots Aias across the battlefield and tells Hektor that they should head towards the middle flank (11.521–42). This remarkable technique almost immediately reunites the two nuclei of action that the narrator had divided just a few minutes before when it cut to Hektor on the left flank (11.497–502), suggesting a confrontation between Aias and Hektor. Kebriones purposefully recognizes Aias when he talks to Hektor (εὖ δέ μιν ἔγνω, 11.526), marking him

out because of the huge shield that he wears across his shoulder (11.527). The two men turn their chariot towards them, with a particularly vivid depiction of the chariot cutting through the field of fallen men (11.531–6) before cutting back to Hektor himself. As in his last attack, here the narrator shies away from giving us details of Hektor's kills, giving us instead a summary of carnage (11.537–41).⁸⁶ In contrast, the narrator tells us specifically that Hektor 'avoided fighting Telamonian Aias' (Αἴαντος δ' ἄλέεινε μάχην Τελαμωνιάδαο, 11.542), going on to explain that Zeus feels shame for Hektor, 'for fighting a better man' (ἀμείνωνι φῶτι μάχοιτο, 11.543). This line is contentious, and without it,⁸⁷ the beat raises questions about Hektor's apparent intentions, which the narrative gives us access to through the verb, 'to avoid' (ἀλεείνω); calling back to Iris's order for Hektor to 'hold back' from the battle with Agamemnon (11.200–9). Whether or not the line is there, the audience must fill in the gaps of *why* Hektor avoids Aias: the line's presence is simply a more explicit reminder that Hektor almost lost to Aias in their single combat (7.214–312). Zeus's action also shows his interest in Hektor again here, reinforcing the 'special relationship' between the two that we have seen before (cf. 11.163f.; 11.182–209).

The next beat switches audience alignment to Aias, where Zeus's intervention strikes fear into him (11.543). The narrative describes Aias first as a fenced-in lion, then as a stubborn ass who finally withdraws, and then provides further access to Aias as he remembers his courage and surges ahead and continues to fight the Trojan onslaught (11.544–73). Audience alignment then follows the gaze of Eurypylos, who sees the struggling Aias and comes in to help (11.575–8), immediately killing Apisaon (11.579). But the narrative switches the audience's alignment again with Paris's gaze, as he sees Eurypylos and intervenes in his stripping Apisaon's armour, hitting him in the thigh with an arrow so that he retreats and exhorts the Achaians to protect Aias (11.585–90). The Achaians follow the wounded Eurypylos and take their stand with Aias (11.591–4).

Mission, Achilles: 11.595–848

The narrator cuts away from the battlefield to Nestor's chariot, carrying Nestor and Machaon back to the Achaian camp (11.595–7 continues from 11.516–20). This scene break would give a performer a chance to take a break if they needed to, as the change of location and characters in the next scenes will provide ample recaps of the last battle sequences.⁸⁸ From Nestor's chariot, the narrative switches audience alignment again to Achilles, appearing for the first time in about ninety

minutes (since 9.665), who sees the chariot approaching the Achaian camp (11.599). Achilles suggests to Patroklos that now might be the time the Achaians finally beg him to come back to battle (11.607–69 recaps 1.239–41). Then he asks Patroklos to go to Nestor and see if it is, indeed, Machaon whom the old man has brought off the field, injured (11.607–14 recaps 11.595–7). Achilles elaborates that ‘Machaon’ is injured (11.613–15 recaps 11.505–20), and that he is Asklepios’s son as he sets this mission for Patroklos. Patroklos sets out immediately, and the audience can now expect to catch up with him soon.

The next beat switches back to the chariot, as Nestor and Machaon arrive and settle into Nestor’s tent, drinking wine served by Hekamede (11.618–42). Patroklos appears in their doorway (11.643), fulfilling our expectation that he would appear (11.616f.). The men try to get Patroklos to sit down, but he refuses, as he says, because he recognizes Machaon (ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς/ γιγνώσκω, ὁρόω δὲ Μαχάονα ποιμένα λαῶν, 12.650f.), fulfilling Achilles’ mission set in the last beat (11.607–14). Patroklos ends by intimating that Achilles will get angry with him if he should dawdle (11.652f.).

This mention of Achilles prompts Nestor to ask why Achilles would care about one wounded Achaian when he knows nothing about what has been happening on the field (11.656–9). Here, the narrative again exploits its melodramatic alignment structure, where gaps between characters’ knowledge allow for different character reactions to the same events. Nestor recaps the Achaians wounded in the previous ‘episode’: Diomedes, shot by an arrow (11.659 recaps 11.369–78); Odysseus, hit by a pike (11.660 recaps 11.435–8); Agamemnon by a spear (11.660 recaps 11.251–3); Eurypylos by an arrow (11.661 recaps 11.585–90); Machaon too (11.662 recaps 11.506f.). As Nestor recounts these injuries to Patroklos, he re-frames them as the result of Achilles’ continuing anger with Agamemnon. He pathetically asks if Achilles will delay his return to battle until after their ships have burnt (cf. Agamemnon 8.229–35), until ‘we are all killed, one after another’ (αὐτοὶ τε κτεινόμεθ’ ἐπισχερώ, 11.667). Then Nestor launches into a long story, about his past victory against Thryoessa with his Pylians, which has only one moral: that great fighting garners great glory, but great glory should be shared (11.760f.).⁸⁹ Nestor’s lesson for Achilles is that his current trajectory will see him alone in his valour, and perhaps one day weeping when he has lost his men (11.762). Here Nestor foreshadows Achilles’ future grief, and creates more ominous tension as he goes into the backstory of his recruiting Patroklos and Achilles into the war effort. Nestor’s recount of Patroklos’s father, Menoitios’s advice to Patroklos before the war becomes particularly significant, as Menoitios tells his son that he is older, but weaker

than Achilles, so must be a counsellor to Achilles (11.785–8).⁹⁰ Nestor uses this advice to set the mission for Patroklos to try to persuade Achilles to return, and if not, to enter the battle himself in Achilles' armour (11.795–800). So Nestor replaces Achilles' mission for Patroklos with this new mission.⁹¹ Nestor's whole speech significantly sets up the possibility not just for Achilles' weeping someday for having lost his friends, but also for the weaker Patroklos's entry into battle.⁹² These possibilities take on a very different shade when any audience knows that Zeus has already prophesied Patroklos's death (8.473–6).

The narrative provides access to Patroklos as Nestor's speech stirs his heart and he runs back to Achilles (11.804); the narrative keeps the audience attached to him as he goes. On his way, near Odysseus's ship (in a callback to Hektor's crying from Odysseus's ship at 11.5), the wounded Eurypylos meets him (11.809–12 recaps his wound from 11.579–94). Seeing Eurypylos, the narrator provides the audience access to Patroklos's pity, as he asks whether or not the Achaians can hold Hektor off now (11.820). Eurypylos' response recaps again that many of them have been forced to retreat from battle with wounds (11.824–6), including the healer Machaon (11.833f.), which justifies his asking Patroklos to help with his wound (11.827–31). This recap challenges the audience's own experience of the battle, where, while many Achaians *have* been wounded, Aias still holds the line (11.564–74). Patroklos's response recaps the previous beat by saying that he is on a mission from Nestor to Achilles (11.838f.), but that he will help Eurypylos, which he does (11.841–8). So both Achilles' and Nestor's 'missions' for Patroklos are left dangling as the narrative returns to the battlefield, though these beats have accomplished new character depths, particularly for Nestor and Patroklos.

Wall alignment: 12.1–39

The performer can take a break after Book 11, as Book 12 starts with a summary of Patroklos' helping Eurypylos (12.1f.), before it switches back to the battle around the Achaian battlements (12.3–9). The narrator recaps that the wall was built against the gods' wishes and will not last long (12.6–9 recaps the exchange between Poseidon and Zeus back at 7.445–63). Most television programmes introduce new episodes in a 'previously on ...' montage of clips from past episodes: even though these recaps remind the viewer of *past* information, they can serve as spoilers in directing the viewer towards past scenes that point towards what will happen in the coming episode.⁹³ The narrative reminds us of

the wall's history here to show that it will play an important role in the scenes to follow,⁹⁴ running parallel with the story arcs of Hektor and Achilles:

ὄφρα μὲν Ἐκτωρ ζῶς ἔην καὶ μῆνι Ἀχιλλεὺς
καὶ Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος ἀπόρθητος πόλις ἔπλεν,
τόφρα δὲ καὶ μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν ἔμπεδον ἦεν.

So long as Hektor was alive, and Achilles raged,
and Priam's city was still un-sacked,
that's how long the Achaians' great wall stood strong.

12.10–12

Around the wall, the narrator links Hektor's death, the end of Achilles' rage, and the fall of Troy.⁹⁵ No one has mentioned Hektor's death since Athena at 8.358f., around three hours ago; now the narrator explicitly places his audience in the time where Hektor still lives.⁹⁶ There is a whole long future that exists in this past, extending far beyond the death of Hektor, and the best Trojans, and many good Achaians, and the fall of Troy, until that day when Apollo and Poseidon destroy the wall (12.12–35).⁹⁷ The scene changes through the contrast, between that future-past day of the wall's destruction and *now* (τότε δ', 12.35) when the battle still rages around the wall, the Achaians pinned by Zeus against their ships, terrified of Hektor (12.35–9). Then the narrative changes audience alignment to Hektor.

Hektor, whirlwind: 12.40–83

The narrative describes Hektor fighting like a whirlwind *as he had before* (αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν ἐμάρνατο ἴσος ἀέλλη, 12.40) creating continuity with where Hektor was before the long interlude in Nestor's tent or the possible performance break (or both) where he did, indeed, fight like a whirlwind (11.296–8; 11.305–8, around forty-five minutes ago without break time). The narrative follows up with an extended simile that describes him as a wild boar or a lion,⁹⁸ surrounded by a hunter and a pack of dogs, who turns in 'the strength of his fury' (σθένει βλεμείνων, 12.42): this formula has only been used of Hektor (cf. 8.337; 9.237), so this simile emphatically draws the audience back into Hektor's character. More, this lion is one 'whose own courage kills him' (12.41–6; ἀγνηορή δέ μιν ἔκτα, 12.46). The animal within the simile dies while Hektor lives, so that the simile subtly picks up on the previous beat's tension between the time when Hektor is alive, and when he will die (12.10). Calling back further, the image of

the lion whose courage kills him hits remarkably close to Andromache's warning to Hektor, that his battle-fury will kill him (φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, 6.407), doubling down to build further audience anticipation for Hektor's future death.⁹⁹ After this simile, Hektor tries to get his troops to cross the Achaian ditch, which sets up the 'problem' for this episode (12.49–59).

Poulydamas has only appeared once before, in the last episode's Trojan catalogue for this battle (11.57–60) and there is little introduction of him with respect to his role or his relationship to Hektor here. His long speech, then, serves as his introduction, as he advises Hektor to continue the attack on foot, since the ditch is too difficult for the horses (12.60–79).¹⁰⁰ Poulydamas's speech contains a weird hypothetical within it that works independently of whether or not the Trojans attack on foot. He says that if Zeus is on their side, then great (12.67–9), and he hopes that the Achaians die here far from Argos (12.69f.); but if the Achaians gain the advantage back, then, he says (with no mention of horses) that none of the Trojans will make it back to the city (12.73f.). Poulydamas's speech leaves this possibility open regardless of their current strategy, and that possibility builds audience investment in considering the outcome of this 'mission'.

The narrative then aligns the audience with Hektor, giving us access to his liking Poulydamas's plan (12.80) as he jumps down from his chariot. The other Trojans jump from their chariots too, when they see him, implicitly reinforcing his place as their leader: his action, not Poulydamas's plan, sets them into motion (12.82f.). They leave their horses by the ditch and get into battle formations, with the new mission of crossing the ditch and attacking the Achaian battlements.

Mission crew: 12.84–109

The scene that follows gives a new catalogue of the Trojans rushing into battle, reintroducing main characters whom we have not seen for a while and introducing new characters, all of whom will play roles in the coming Trojan attack on the wall (replacing the catalogue at 11.57–60).¹⁰¹

Hektor and Poulydamas lead the first group, and of course we have just seen both of them, but the narrative gives the added information that they command the best men, the most men, the men who really want to destroy the wall (μέμασαν δὲ μάλιστα/ τεῖχος ῥηξάμενοι, 12.89f.). Kebriones, Hektor's last charioteer (12.91 creates continuity from 11.521–42), goes with them. Paris leads the next group (last seen wounding Machaon at 11.505–7), with newcomer Alkathoös and Agenor (Antenor's son last seen at 11.59). Then Helenos, who has

been absent since he advised Hektor to call a single combat all the way back at 7.44. With him, newcomer Deiphobos, another of Priam's sons, and Asios, the leader of Arisbe, in his first appearance since the first catalogue at 2.837f. Then Aineias (briefly glimpsed at 11.58 and 6.75–7, but not active since Book 5), with two more of Antenor's sons, Archelochos, whom we have also not seen since the first Trojan catalogue (12.100 = 2.823), and Akamas, who has made brief appearances at 6.18 and 11.88. Sarpedon (last seen at 5.692) and Glaukos (last seen at 7.13) lead the last group, with another newcomer, Asteropaios. That comes to fifteen characters, of which three are completely new, and two have not been seen since the catalogue, which was over seven hours ago. Even many of the main characters reintroduced here, including Aineias, Sarpedon, and Glaukos, have been all but missing for between three and a half and five hours. But the narrative needs them for this mission, and needs these characters with so many of the primary Achaian characters out with wounds, to expand its narrative laterally. Now this battle sequence reshapes the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure with this new constellation of characters poised, as they are, around the Achaian wall.

Wall fight!: 12.110–94

The scene changes through the narrator's judgement of Asios who does not follow Poulydamas's commands and who will consequently die at Idomeneus's hands, signposting a future event that will not actually happen for some time (12.110–16; the death itself comes at 13.386–93).¹⁰² As Asios charges his horses towards the gates, the audience's alignment switches to the Lapithai, who guard the gate (12.127). Just as with the Trojan crew, the Achaians that the narrative sets against them have not appeared in a while: Polypoites since 6.29, Leonteus since the catalogue (2.745).

Through the following scenes, these now-established characters from both sides act around the wall. The first fight between the Lapithai and Asios's men ends in Asios breaking through the gate (12.145–50), only to be bombarded with missiles and stones (12.151–61). Asios prays to Zeus for help (12.161–72), but the narrator says that Zeus does not listen because he wants to give glory to Hektor (12.173f.) and this audience access to Zeus should remind them that Zeus granted the glory to Hektor in the previous battle sequence (11.186–209).

Taking advantage of the melodramatic alignment structure now based around the Achaian wall, the narrator zooms out and says, weakly, that 'others fought

fighters around other gates' (ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι μάχην ἐμάχοντο πύλησιν, 12.175), before saying how difficult it is for *him* to recount all the fights along the wall (12.176–7).¹⁰³ This gives the impression of a vast battle that we only catch glimpses of going on all around, adding depth to our experience of the characters that we are aligned with (we can compare this strategy to that used in *Game of Thrones*' 'Hardhome' battle sequence, as we saw in the Introduction). The narrative gives the audience access, too, saying that the Argives keep fighting since they must defend their ships (12.1178f.), while the gods who support them feel dejected watching them on their back feet (12.179f.).

The scene switches back to the Lapithai, and the narrator identifies Polypoites as Perithoös's son before he kills Damasos and Pylon and Ormenos (12.182–7), and Leonteus as Ares' son before he kills Hippomachos, Antiphates, Menon, Orestes, and Iamenos (12.188–94). The narrator has never before mentioned Hippomachos, Antiphates, or Menon: they are anonymous and expendable. Menon and Orestes, though, we might remember as Asios's men from 12.139. All of these lost stand in contrast to Polypoites and Leonteus, whom the narrator has now spent two full beats with, with repeated introductions through their lineage: the narrative expects us now to at least recognize them. We leave them stripping the armour from their kills (12.195).

Hektor/Wall: 12.195–289

The narrative uses a 'meanwhile' device to switch beats from the Lapithai back to Poulydamas and Hektor with their troops (reintroducing them, 12.197f. = 12.89f.), still standing at the edge of the ditch trying to figure out how to cross (ὄφρ' ... τόφρ', 12.195f.). The narrator left them less than ten minutes of performance time ago at full charge towards the Danaans (12.106f.), but now they stand on the edge of the ditch, still (ἔτι) pondering how to cross it (12.198f.).¹⁰⁴

While they stand, a bird-sign: an eagle carries a snake that bites back and forces the eagle to drop it and fly off (12.200–7). The narrator provides the audience access to the Trojans as they shiver in fear at the sight,¹⁰⁵ which sets up the bad news that Poulydamas immediately gives Hektor: the Trojans will break through the Achaian wall, but they will not all make it back to Troy alive (12.223–7). With this prophecy, Poulydamas gives legitimacy to the potential scenario that he already suggested at 12.71–4, where the Trojans will have a hard time making it back to Troy alive once the Achaians turn them back from the ships. But unlike some of the previous predictions/prophesies from past episodes that

mention danger for the Trojans near the ships (Zeus at 8.473–6; Achilles at 9.651–5), Poulydamas addresses this *to* Hektor, giving *him* that information to act on as he urges him not to attack the Achaian ships (12.216).

So Hektor has, it *seems*, a choice, and knowledge to act on. But dramatic tension arises as Hektor tries to fit this new knowledge in with what *he* already knows. Hektor angrily suggests that Poulydamas has asked him ‘to forget thundering Zeus’s advice’ (12.235f.). Hektor claims he will take Zeus’s will over any bird-sign. This argument engages shared memory: the audience was ‘there’, after all, when Zeus (through Iris) made his battlefield glory promise to Hektor (11.200–9). But the audience still knows things that Hektor does not: that Achilles will check Hektor at the ships (Zeus at 8.473–6; Achilles at 9.651–5); that Hektor will die (Athena at 8.358f.). These contradictions create ambiguity around Hektor that affects how people judge his decision to fight on despite the bird-sign. But that ambiguity also forces strong character engagement: allegiance for or against.¹⁰⁶

The rest of Hektor’s speech raises similar issues of ambiguity and judgement. Here he famously says that the best bird-sign is to defend your country (12.242). Then he imagines that ‘even if’ (εἴ περ γάρ τ’, 12.244) all the other men died by the Argive ships, Poulydamas would be fine because he is such a coward (12.244–7). This image confirms the previous beat’s possibility of heavy Trojan losses by the ships (12.72–4), and, in an ‘Easter egg’ (a detail that only certain fans would latch onto), points towards Poulydamas’s survival, at least in the *Iliad*.¹⁰⁷ Hektor also provides the audience access to his values, as he places bravery and willingness to fight *above* survival, and he reinforces this value with a death threat for any man who runs away.¹⁰⁸ The narrative then shows him leading on the Trojans without any comment, leaving the audience to make their own judgements on Hektor.

The beat switches audience alignment to Zeus, who follows above the Trojans with a windstorm (12.252–4) that beguiles the Achaians while giving the Trojans, and Hektor, the glory (12.254f.). This beat strongly confirms Hektor’s reasoning in the last, giving further information for audience allegiance to him. Here, Zeus does still give him the glory that he granted back at 11.200–9, and indeed, the Trojans are ‘convinced by these signs’ (τεράεσσι πεποιθότες, 12.256), pushing aside the previous beat’s bird-sign. The Trojans work on tearing down the wall (12.257–62), reinforcing the sequence’s mission, but the Achaians do not give way (12.262–4).

As the Trojans try to tear down the wall, the narrative switches audience alignment back to the Aiantes, who exhort the Achaians to hold their ground and even to think ahead to taking the city (12.265–76). Once the narrative has

given the audience access to this Achaian perspective on the Trojan attack on their wall, it once again zooms out to show the *mêlée* as a whole, carefully keeping the audience perched between sides around the wall. In a callback to the first beats of the wall fight, the narrative compares the stones thrown by both sides to Zeus's snowstorms (12.278–89; cf. 12.156f.). So the whole wall thundered (12.289).

Wall fight!: 12.290–431

The narrator switches beats with a contrafactual,¹⁰⁹ saying that Hektor and the Trojans would not have broken in the gates if it had not been for Zeus driving Sarpedon, his son, against the Argives (12.290–3).¹¹⁰ The phrasing reveals that the Trojans *will* break down the gates, building audience anticipation for that event. At the same time, the narrative now aligns the audience with Sarpedon as a protagonist of the next beat, reintroducing his relationship to Zeus (about fifteen minutes after the narrative named him, Glaukos, and Asteropaios as the leaders of the last Trojan battalion, 12.101–4). The narrative attaches the audience to Sarpedon throughout this beat, first describing him in detail as he prepares to attack the wall (12.298–308), then providing the audience access to his character and Glaukos's in their famous exchange about their roles and motivations in fighting. Their exchange insists that they must fight because of their roles as leaders, and because they must die anyway, they might as well die for glory (12.310–28). With this access, the narrative invites audience allegiance with both Lykian lords before they rush into battle (12.330).

The scene switches audience alignment as the Lykian lords charge, following the gaze of Menestheus and giving the audience access to him as he shivers when he sees them coming (12.331f.). The narrative creates alignment through reintroduction, access, and attachment to Menestheus. The narrative reintroduces Menestheus here as the son of Peteos: this is his first appearance since 4.327 (around six and a half hours ago without breaks). He looks everywhere along the wall for help, until he finally sees the Aiantes on the wall (12.335). Here, the narrative constructs the illusion of continuity in its disparate character story arcs as it left the Aiantes exhorting their troops at 12.269–76, a few minutes ago, before Menestheus now finds them still on the wall. Menestheus sends a runner to them on a mini-mission, asking that at least Telamonian Aias and Teukros come to help him against the Lykian lords (12.342–50). The narrative keeps our alignment with the runner into the next beat, as he runs *along the wall* to find

them (παρὰ τεῖχος, 12.352). So the wall continues to play as the spatial convergence point for these multiple storylines. The runner Thoötes conveys (and recaps) Menestheus's message (12.354–63 recaps 12.343–50), and Telamonian Aias agrees to help him (12.364–9), creating audience anticipation for his confrontation with Sarpedon and Glaukos and his return to this point on the wall, as he leaves Oilean Aias and Lykomedes.

Now the narrative keeps the audience attached to Telamonian Aias, along with Teukros, while he reiterates their relationship as half-brothers and adds Pandion to their mission to help Menestheus (12.370–2).¹¹¹ They make their way back across the battlefield 'inside the wall' (τείχεος ἐντὸς ἰόντες, 12.374) back to Menestheus (12.373), completing the mini-mission set two beats earlier (12.342–50). Here, Aias kills Epikles, a red-shirt that the narrative introduces only to show his death, introducing him as 'Sarpedon's companion' (12.379). His death so raises the stakes for Sarpedon himself, and creates further audience anticipation for Aias confronting Sarpedon. Teukros then strikes Glaukos, bringing our main Lykians back into the action after the mini-mission to retrieve Aias and Teukros (Glaukos was last seen at 12.329). Teukros hits Glaukos with an arrow as he runs on the wall (ἐπεσσύμενον βάλε τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο, 12.388), forcing him to secretly retreat from shame (12.387–90). So the narrative almost instantaneously switches audience alignment from Teukros to Glaukos, and then on to Sarpedon, giving the audience access to his sadness when he sees his companion leave the field. But Sarpedon keeps fighting (12.392f.), and he kills Alkmaon (in a one-time appearance, 12.394f.), before wrenching down part of the wall with his hands (12.397–9), fulfilling some of the 'mission' set at 12.61–80 for the Trojans to cross the ditch and attack the Achaian wall.

The narrative switches audience alignment to Aias and Teukros, who then both try to hit Sarpedon, but Zeus protects him from harm, so that he is simply driven back slightly (12.400–7). Sarpedon exhorts the other Lykians (12.408–12), and the wall fight continues, between Sarpedon and his Lykians and the Danaans on the other side (12.414–31).

Hektor/Wall: 12.432–71

The narrative emphasizes the deadlock between the sides along the wall through a simile, comparing them to the evenly balanced wool of a widow with her scales, trying to make a living for her children (12.432–5). It is perhaps no accident that this is the image that brings Hektor back into the action, tying him to widowhood

as Andromache herself had (cf. 6.408f.). So the battle stays in balance until Zeus lets Hektor have the greater glory to be the first to break through the wall (12.437; cf. 11.300, 12.174, 12.255).¹¹² Hektor turns to his Trojans and urges them to break the wall (12.439–41), before charging and throwing a massive stone against the doors (12.445–57): the narrative goes to great lengths in describing both the rock and the doors before the break occurs. The gates give way and Hektor attacks, his face like fast night; his armour all ablaze; his two spears in hand; his eyes flashing like fire (12.463–6). No one could have stood up to him, except for the gods (12.465f.). The narrative pays a huge amount of attention to visual details throughout this passage, making it particularly memorable.¹¹³ This is especially true of its depiction of Hektor. I have no idea what fast night looks like, but Hektor sounds terrifying here.¹¹⁴ And the narrative gives access to the audience to confirm this, as the Achaians are (appropriately) terrified, scattering towards their ships in Hektor's wake, as the Trojan side pours over the wall or through the gates (12.469–71).¹¹⁵ For Hektor, this feels like a character overhaul, but the narrative will not reveal the details of individual character responses to this 'Hektor' until the next beat.

Hektor's breaking through the Achaian gates resolves the problem posed at the beginning of the beat sequence, suggesting a point at which the performer might take a break, and pointing to the possibility of most of Book 12 standing as an episode. The glory that Zeus promised Hektor in the previous 'episode' (11.200–9) finally comes to fruition through this action. The vivid description of Hektor as he succeeds leaves the action in a memorable cliffhanger,¹¹⁶ with Poulydamas's warnings and the bird-sign left dangling for what will happen to the Trojans after they have broken through the Achaian battlements. This will be dealt with in the next episodes, while the plot points from Zeus's prophecy (8.473–7), including Patroklos's death and Achilles' return and confrontation with Hektor, still lurk in the more distant future.

Zeus/Poseidon: 13.1–129

Book 13 uses a summary to switch scenes,¹¹⁷ again pointing to a possible performance break between the books as the narrator attaches the audience to Zeus, first driving Hektor and the Trojans against the ships, and then leaving to look over northern lands (13.1–6). Even with Zeus, the narrative exploits its melodramatic alignment structure, as Zeus now does not pay attention to the Trojans because he does not think that any of the gods would intervene (13.7–9).

But Poseidon *is* paying attention (13.10), which creates a gap in what the two gods will know through the next episode(s). The narrative aligns the audience with Poseidon, attaching to him as he watches the Trojans beating the Achaians, giving access as he gets angry at Zeus about it: the narrative keeps the audience aligned with Poseidon as he heads down to his house in the ocean and gears up and grabs his chariot and rides to the beach at Troy (13.11–31),¹¹⁸ even showing him parking his horses (13.32–8). All this attention establishes Poseidon as a primary character in this ‘episode’, and shows again how the narrative foregrounds less significant characters in its middle episodes to laterally expand its drama while keeping the plot where it needs to be.¹¹⁹

The narrative briefly switches audience alignment to Hektor and the Trojans, all together like ‘fire’ or a ‘stormcloud’ (φλογί; θυέλλη, 13.39), as they hope to seize the ships of the Achaians and kill all their best men around them (13.41f.). But then the audience aligns again with Poseidon, as he disguises himself as Kalchas to exhort the Aiantes. Poseidon’s speech recaps the end of the last episode, saying that the Trojans have ‘come over the wall’ (μέγα τεῖχος ὑπερκατέβησαν, 13.50 recaps 12.462–71). Then ‘Kalchas’ tells them that the Achaians will be able to hold all the Trojans, except for Hektor. To explain, Kalchas/Poseidon describes Hektor as overhauled; he is a ‘madman, like fire’ (ὁ λυσσώδης φλογί εἵκελος, 13.53). This repeats the narrative description of the Trojans like ‘fire’ (13.39; cf. 12.466), and the reference to Hektor as mad recalls Teukros’s seeing Hektor as a ‘raging dog’ in yesterday’s battle (8.299). Then Poseidon says that Hektor claims to be the mighty son of Zeus (ὄς Διὸς εὖχετ’ ἐρισθενέος πάϊς εἶναι, 13.54), which recalls Hektor’s close connection with Zeus in these last books, but with also confuses Hektor’s identity and plays into his character overhaul. Hektor himself has made no such claim, as far as the audience knows: do they believe this disguised Poseidon? Or is this just rhetoric to stir the spirits of the troops? Or, perhaps, Hektor has boasted to be the son of Zeus, somewhere in the in-betweens, when the narrator was not with him. Again, this ambiguity asks the audience to engage in Hektor’s character. Finally, Poseidon tells the Aiantes that they can drive Hektor back from the fast-running ships, even if the Olympian (Zeus) himself rouses him (εἰ καί μιν Ὀλύμπιος αὐτὸς ἐγείρει, 13.57f.). Poseidon’s ‘if’ here adds some troublesome ambiguity to Zeus’s support for Hektor. The audience knows that Zeus supports Hektor, from his promise back at 11.186–209; but they also now know that Zeus has left Troy (13.1–9). This leaves the possible extent of his support now up in the air, and builds tension with the audience. When Poseidon finishes speaking, he imbues both Aiantes with strong battle-fury, hitting them with his staff (13.59f.).¹²⁰

Poseidon leaves them, and Oïlean Aias recognizes that a god has just spoken to them (13.65–75). Telamonian Aias agrees, and claims that he can feel his strength rising, presumably from this divine encounter (13.77–9). He reasserts Hektor’s identity as Priam’s son and wants to take on Hektor (adding a refutation to Poseidon’s claim that Hektor was the ‘son of Zeus’, Διὸς . . . παῖς, at 13.54), even though he is insatiably eager to fight (μενοιῶω δὲ καὶ οἶος/Ἔκτορι Πριαμίδῃ ἄμοτον μεμαῶτι μάχεσθαι, 13.79f.). This humanizes Hektor once more and returns him from his ‘overhaul’ to the realm of the recognizable.

Mission crew: 13.83–129

The next beat resumes the audience’s alignment with Poseidon as he goes from man to man along the ranks (13.83–93). This ‘mini-catalogue’ recalls for the audience which Achaians are still on the field after the wounded withdrawals of Book 11. As with the Trojan ‘mission crew’ assembled before their charge on the Achaian wall in the last ‘episode’ (12.88–104), many of the Achaians here have not been seen for many hours of performance time, and are reintroduced now to play parts in the battle to come. These include Teukros (last seen at 12.400), Leïtos (last seen at 6.35), Peneleos (last seen in the catalogue at 2.494), Deïpyros (last seen at 9.83), Thoas (last seen at 7.168), Meriones (last seen at 10.270), and Antilochos (not seen since 6.32). Poseidon’s exhortation to the Achaians that follows also includes important recaps, both to a past that exists before the *Iliad*’s narrative time began, as well as to previous events within the epic. Poseidon contrasts the current situation of the Trojans fighting near the ships with a past when the Trojans were always like frightened deer to the Achaians and did not want to face the Achaians’ battle-fury and their hands (13.101–6; cf. 9.353f.). Then Poseidon explains the difference between these times as the fault of Agamemnon and his quarrel with Achilles (13.111–3), recapping the events of Book 1 while judging that Agamemnon in particular is to blame. Poseidon ends his rousing speech with a warning to the men. I include all these lines here, because they use the recap of the last battle sequence around the wall to build audience expectation for what is to come:

ὦ πέπονες τάχα δὴ τι κακὸν ποιήσετε μείζον
 τῆδε μεθημοσύνη· ἀλλ’ ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθε ἕκαστος
 αἰδῶ καὶ νέμεσιν· δὴ γὰρ μέγα νεῖκος ὄρωρεν.
 Ἔκτωρ δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ βοῆν ἀγαθὸς πολεμίζει
 καρτερός, ἔρρηξεν δὲ πύλας καὶ μακρὸν ὄχηα.

‘Friends, soon you’re going to make something worse happen
with your carelessness. Each of you, think about
shame and retribution. Cause a big fight has begun.
Now Hektor, with his good war-cry, makes war by our ships,
and he’s strong – he broke through the gates and their big lock.’

Poseidon, 13.120–4

Following Poseidon’s exhortation, the Achaians stand against the Trojans and brilliant Hektor (Τρῳάς τε καὶ Ἑκτορα δῖον ἔμμυνον, 13.129) in a dense line.¹²¹

Hektor again: 13.130–205

After all this time spent aligned with Poseidon and the Achaians, the narrative finally switches the audience’s alignment to the Trojans and Hektor, attaching to them as they attack. The narrator describes Hektor through a long simile of a rock wrenched from a cliff-face, violently rolling forward until it comes to a stop, just as he himself does when he comes up against the Achaian vanguard (13.136–46):¹²² quite a different image from Hektor *as* a whirlwind, as the force acting, rather than acted upon (cf. 12.40; 11.296–8; 11.305–8). There, Hektor rallies the troops, shouting that he will break through the Achaian line, if the best of the gods, Hera’s thundering husband, actually drives him on (εἰ ἐτεόν με/ ὄρσε θεῶν ὄριστος, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις, Ἥρης 13.155). Hektor’s conditional ‘if’ picks up on the contextual shift that has happened since Hektor last spoke of Zeus’s support (Zeus is not watching now), and reflects the ‘if’ of Poseidon’s exhortation at 13.57. When Hektor responded to Poulydamas before storming the Achaian battlements, he was so sure of Zeus’s support that he was willing to ignore bird-signs (12.231–50). Now, even if Hektor is only being rhetorical, his language suggests the possibility that Zeus may not be supporting him, which would resonate with the audience that knows that Zeus is no longer paying attention to the fight, and so cannot intervene on Hektor’s behalf (13.1–9). Responding to Hektor’s exhortation, Deiphobos strides out to fight, and Meriones takes a shot at him, piercing his shield but missing him (13.156–62). Both men retreat: Deiphobos out of fear, Meriones to get a new spear (13.156–68). Meriones’ mission sets up a dangling storyline that builds audience anticipation to see him again in the next few beats.

Then Teukros kills Imbrios, whom the narrative introduces with a long backstory so that the audience might feel a little for him, when Teukros stabs him through the head with his spear (13.170–82). The information that the narrative provides about Imbrios, especially that he was married to one of

Priam's daughters and was honoured as one of Priam's own children, necessarily relates him to Hektor, emotionally anchoring him to someone the audience is already invested in. More, the narrative juxtaposes his death and Hektor's intervention in the next beat: this juxtaposition replaces the often-used trope of following an emotional response back to a death's witness. So rather than see Hektor react to Imbrios's death and attack Teukros, the narrative just puts those two things back-to-back, leaving a gap where we can project our own understanding of their connection.

Hektor tries to hit Teukros with his spear, but misses and hits Amphimachos instead, who appears here for the first time since the catalogue only to die (13.183–7; cf. 2.870f.). As Hektor tries to strip his armour, Aias attacks, driving his spear against Hektor's shield so he drives him back, and the Achaians are able to rescue both corpses (13.185–94). Stichios and Menestheus take Amphimachos's body back to the Achaians (13.195f.), while the Aiantes strip Imbrios's corpse (13.197–202). Oïlean Aias, furious over Amphimachos's death, hacks off Imbrios's head and throws it like a ball until it lands in the dust at Hektor's feet (13.202–5). The action stands out in its being the only time a hero in the *Iliad* ever throws a dismembered body part at another hero, and in the vividness of its short descriptive simile of the decapitated head 'spinning like a ball' (σφαιρηδὸν ἐλιξάμενος, 13.204).¹²³ Whether the narrative wants to keep a distance from Hektor to draw him as more of an enemy for the moment, or to allow the audience pity for him, either way, the narrative does not allow the audience access to Hektor's response to this head landing at his feet. In fact, beyond omitting Hektor's response, the narrator leaves Hektor full-stop for the next half hour of performance time. Removing Hektor, even in his role as the primary antagonist, for several scenes in this 'episode' allows the narrative to prolong audience anticipation for seeing him in direct confrontation and to foreground other characters, giving the audience new choices of whom to emotionally invest in through the battle beats to come.

Idomeneus/Meriones: 13.206–333

The next beat emphasizes audience distance from Hektor when it switches alignment to give us access, instead, to Poseidon, who, like Oïlean Aias, also grieves angrily over the dead Amphimachos (13.206–9; cf. 13.202f.). Turning the audience away from Hektor and the Aiantes, the narrative now takes a break from battle. In a series of beats that focus on dialogue exchanges, the narrative

reasserts character values in the storyworld in order to build emotional investment and ethical perspective on the battle to follow.

These dialogue beats include exchanges at the edge of battle between Poseidon (disguised as Thoas) and Idomeneus (13.210–39), and between Idomeneus and his companion Meriones (13.246–329). First Poseidon (as Thoas) runs into Idomeneus (13.210–30), the Cretan lord who did appear once in the previous episode (12.117) but will now take on a more major role in the coming beats. Idomeneus's speech here focuses on not hanging back from the fight, even if Zeus supports the other side (13.224–30). After Idomeneus has armed himself in his shelter (13.239–44), he runs into Meriones as he makes his way back to battle. Again, the narrative masterfully suggests continuity in character story arcs, picking up the dangling storyline of Meriones leaving the battlefield at 13.164–8 to get a new spear from the camp. This, too, is the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure in action, as the audience knows why Meriones left the battle when Idomeneus asks him (13.249–53), and so gets pleasure when they hear Meriones recap his spear breaking in his clash with Deiphobos (13.255–8 recaps 13.159–62). But in this short speech, Meriones also asks Idomeneus if he can get one of Idomeneus's spears, since his own tent is far away, which the audience would not have necessarily anticipated; this surprise, too, gives pleasure. Their exchange continues with a focus on Meriones' bravery, which Idomeneus's response places within a broader discussion of courage. Brave men do not go pale with fear (13.279–86). Meriones, as a brave man, will die with a spear in his front, because he will not run away (13.288–91). Finally, Idomeneus tells Meriones to take a spear from his tent (13.294), and the two men move to return to battle. Through this long exchange, the narrative builds not just alignment with these two characters, but allegiance, as the audience knows their values, how they think of themselves and how they think about fighting before they return to it. These character allegiances then re-ground the audience in the storyworld's values as the narrative moves back into battle.

The narrative uses their return to map out the battlefield, which has changed since fighting now takes place near the Achaian ships instead of around the wall as in the previous episodes. Meriones asks Idomeneus if they should enter at the right, left, or centre of battle, and Idomeneus recaps in his response that Teukros and the Aiantes fight in the centre, and they can hold Hektor (13.306–27; cf. 13.50, 13.101). Idomeneus describes Hektor in ways similar to Poseidon did, saying that he is 'strong' (κατερός, 13.316; cf. 13.124), and to Aias, repeating that Hektor is 'really eager to fight' (μάλα περ μεμαῶτι μάχεσθαι, 13.317; cf. 13.80). But Idomeneus claims that unless Zeus himself sets fire to the ships, Hektor will not succeed: this seems to acknowledge Zeus's support of Hektor (cf. 13.52–4), at the

same time that it plays on audience knowledge that Zeus's support for Hektor will only go so far (cf. 11.186–209). Here, Idomeneus is sure that Aias can take Hektor, supporting Aias's earlier confidence (cf. 13.79f.), going so far as to say that Aias could stand his ground against any mortal, even Achilles (13.321–4). This recalls Achilles' absence from the fighting, and re-establishes Aias's status as 'best' in that absence, as well as recalling Aias's superiority over Hektor from previous beats (cf. 7.244–322; 11.538–43). With Idomeneus's reasoning, Meriones and Idomeneus decide to re-enter the fray on the left flank (13.326–9). The beat switches alignment to show the men on the left flank swarming Idomeneus and his henchmen as they return to battle (13.330–3; cf. 7.1–7), reinforcing the audience's own allegiance with the Cretan lords. Now Idomeneus is also 'like a flame' (φλογὶ εἴκελον, 13.330, cf. Hektor 13.53), as he becomes central to this next beat sequence.

Zeus/Poseidon: 13.334–60

The narrative 'zooms out' from the left flank to show the audience the chaos of battle all around these main characters (13.334–44),¹²⁴ and then to explain that battle through the competing wills of 'two sons of Kronos': Zeus and Poseidon. The narrative recaps Zeus's complicated motivations as wanting victory for the Trojans and for Hektor and glorifying fast-footed Achilles, but not wanting to completely destroy the Achaians, but only to honour Thetis and her son (13.347–50 recaps 1.517–27). Then the narrative recaps Poseidon's coming out of the water, his bitterness against Zeus, his pity for the Argives (13.351–3 recaps 13.15f.), and his going around all the time in disguise (13.355–7; cf. 13.45, 13.216). The narrative provides new information about why Poseidon disguises himself, explaining it as a response to the fact that Zeus is elder and knows more than Poseidon (13.354f.). The narrative only implies Zeus's ignorance of the current state of battle through its twice-describing Poseidon's actions as 'in secret' (λάθρη, 13.352, 13.358). This short narrative beat explains the present battle within the longer story arcs of the gods: it only lasts about a minute before the narrator returns to Idomeneus.

Idomeneus/Meriones: 13.361–580

The narrator describes Idomeneus as 'half-grey' (μεσαιπόλιος, 13.361) as he calls on the Danaans, charges against the Trojans, and kills Othryoneus (13.363). At

his death, the narrative gives the audience Othryoneus's backstory, that he had promised Priam to fight well in exchange for one of his daughters (13.363–9). Idomeneus knows this story too, because he sarcastically mocks Othryoneus as he drags his corpse off the battlefield, saying that he will marry him off to one of Agamemnon's daughters in Argos (13.374–82). With Idomeneus dragging Othryoneus's corpse, Asios reappears after fifty minutes of performance time (last seen at 12.172). Asios tries to strike Idomeneus, but Idomeneus drives his spear right through his head while Antilochos kills Asios's charioteer (13.384–99). The narrative gives very little information about Asios here, and makes no comment that his death was predicted as a comment on his decision to refuse Poulydamas's orders and abandon his chariot way back at 12.113–5. But those who have been paying attention would get certain pleasure from the resolution of this dangling storyline from a previous 'episode'.

As the battle continues, the narrative constantly switches the audience's alignment between sides, following the direction of gazes and emotional responses to battlefield deaths. First Deiphobos grieves when he sees Asios fall and rushes at Idomeneus (13.402–9), but overshoots, hitting Hypsenor instead (13.410–2), which he accepts as a consolation prize in his vaunt over the body (13.413–16). Then the Achaians grieve at Deiphobos's vaunt, especially Antilochos, who protects Hypsenor's corpse as Mekisteus and Alastor rescue the body (13.417–23). When the narrative switches alignment back to Idomeneus, it pushes Alkathoo's into his path, with a long reintroduction as Anchises' son-in-law and Hippodameia's wife, after he was only first introduced in the Trojan 'mission crew', at 12.93. Here Poseidon puts the whammy on the man so that he cannot move and Idomeneus stabs him with a spear through the heart (13.434–44). Idomeneus vaunts over the corpse, and Deiphobos responds by thinking to go and fetch Aineias to help him (13.455–9). Deiphobos finds Aineias on the edge of the battle, standing in anger against Priam (13.459f.).¹²⁵ Aineias, too, has not appeared since the Trojan mission crew against the wall was assembled (12.99): the previous beat prepares for his return, in its careful placement of Alkathoo's into Aineias's family structure, and it is this connection that Deiphobos uses to convince the man, angry over Hypsenor's death (13.468), to help him.

Aineias charges Idomeneus, and Idomeneus calls on his companions to help him against his charge: Askalaphos, Aphareus, Deipyros (all last seen at 9.82f.), with Meriones and Antilochos (13.469–79). As Idomeneus calls out to them, he picks up on why the narrator introduced him as going grey when he returned to the fray (13.361), as now Idomeneus claims that Aineias is beating him because he is a younger man (13.481–6). As all these Achaians assemble, the narrative

switches audience alignment back to Aineias, who himself calls several of his companions to help, including Deïphobos, Paris, and Agenor (13.490). This creates continuity with the battle sequence in Book 12, as an attentive audience would remember that the fallen Alkathoös commanded a battalion along with Paris and Agenor, back at 12.93, the last time either of them were seen. Now they rush in to help Aineias fight over Alkathoös's corpse (13.491–8). Of all the men fighting, the narrative tells us, Aineias and Idomeneus are the best (13.499f.). Aineias throws his spear, misses and hits the ground; Idomeneus throws and hits Oinomaos, eviscerating him (13.502–8). Missiles drive Idomeneus out of the battle before he can strip the body, with Deïphobos trying again for him, with another miss as he kills Askalaphos (13.510–20). The narrative takes a moment away from the battle to exploit its melodramatic alignment structure, as Ares remains unaware when his son Askalaphos falls (13.521–5). Then the narrative switches audience alignment back to Deïphobos, who strips Askalaphos's helmet, but Meriones quickly intervenes and stabs Deïphobos in the arm before ducking back into the crowd (13.526–32). So the narrative reintroduces Polites *as* Deïphobos's brother, in his first appearance since the catalogue at 2.791, as he rushes in to rescue Deïphobos and carry him off the battlefield (13.533–9).

Now the narrative switches audience alignment back to Aineias, who strikes Aphareus (13.541). Then there is a true cut to Antilochos,¹²⁶ who kills Thoön and tries to strip his armour (13.545–50); the Trojans attack Antilochos and Poseidon must protect him (13.551–5). Asios's son Adamas recognizes that Poseidon protects Antilochos and goes to retreat, but Meriones hits him in the guts with his thrown spear (13.560–75). The narrative cuts again, appropriately to Helenos (not seen since the Trojan mission crew with Deïphobos and Asios at 12.94) who kills Deïpyros (13.576–80). Throughout this latest fight scene, the narrative switches audience alignment so fast it is hard to maintain any *one* alignment, or to only hold one allegiance. But in this flurry of cuts and alignment switches, the narrative deftly continues to build audience allegiance to certain characters, through the emotional impacts of their deaths within carefully constructed social networks.¹²⁷ The narrative especially rewards attentive audience members who remember the connections between characters, both in terms of their relationships to one another and through their positions on the battlefield. Even the time spent investing in building an allegiance with Idomeneus and Meriones becomes undermined in the speed of this battle; but the values established in that earlier scene between the two are what the audience can use to judge the actions of all these many characters in the heat of battle.

Menelaos: 13.581–673

Idomeneus and Meriones have both faded out of the action again, and suddenly in the fray, in response to the death of Deïpyros, Menelaos appears for the first time since he helped Odysseus off the battlefield back at 11.487 (around a hundred and ten minutes ago in performance time, without breaks). But the narrative brought Paris back into the *mêlée* at 13.491–8, and with the Aiantes and Teukros presumably still in the centre flank (cf. 13.306–27), and the rest of the principal Achaians wounded, it seems appropriate that Menelaos reappears now. Menelaos manages to wound Helenos in the hand, sending him back into the crowd (13.581–97). Then Peisandros (who also has not appeared since 11.143) comes against Menelaos, and quickly dies (13.601–19).

During this beat, the narrator addresses Menelaos directly in an apostrophe, continuing his special alignment with him (σοὶ Μενέλαε, 13.603).¹²⁸ This matters as Menelaos vaunts over the corpse, because his speech fosters allegiance, and this allegiance, in turn, will bring the audience to question their relationship to Hektor. In his long vaunt, Menelaos recaps the Trojan theft of Helen as a crime against guest-friendship (13.626f.), specifically invoking Zeus *Xenios*, the god who protects guest-friendship, as the one who will completely sack their city one day (13.625). This is the first reminder for a long time that the Trojans are in the wrong, and the fact that it comes from Menelaos, the man wronged, means something, especially when the narrator has taken the pains to single him out by addressing him directly. Menelaos also characterizes the Trojans beyond breaking the rules of guest-friendship. He calls them arrogant and insatiable when it comes to war (13.61), full of insolence and shameful (13.622), violent (13.633). Their battle-fury is reckless (13.634) and he repeats that they can never get enough of war (13.635). Finally, he lists all the lovely things men can find satisfaction in: sleeping and sex and sweet song and blameless dance (13.636f.) – but the Trojans only want war. This long speech, much like the earlier exchange between Idomeneus and Meriones (13.248–94), details Menelaos's values and creates allegiance with Menelaos that might question or call into conflict any of the audience's standing allegiances with the Trojans. These values can also be applied to Hektor in particular. Other characters in this episode have focused on Hektor's eagerness to fight (Aias at 13.80; Idomeneus at 13.317): where is the line between being eager to fight, and never being able to get enough of fighting? Andromache has said that Hektor's battle-fury will kill him (6.407) – is it reckless? Were Poseidon's views of Hektor as a raging mad man correct (13.53)? Were Teukros's (8.299)?

As Menelaos finishes his speech and turns again to stripping the body, Harpalion comes at him, only to die when hit by Meriones' arrow (13.643–55). The narrative introduces Harpalion as the son of the Paphlagonian king Pylaimenes (who died at 5.576).¹²⁹ But now, Menelaos kills Harpalion, and his father reappears to carry the corpse off the battlefield, without a death-price (13.643–59). Now Paris appears in sorrow for the fallen Harpalion, because, significantly, Harpalion was Paris's *guest-friend* (ξείνος, 13.662). Here, just less than three minutes after Menelaos's damning vaunt about the Trojan violation against Zeus *Xenios*, Paris's guest-friendship governs his emotional response: these successive beats necessarily engage audience allegiance. Does this redeem Paris? Is there a conscious effort on the part of the narrator to reform the view of Paris, in contrast to what Menelaos has just said? Is this hypocrisy? The narrative-built allegiance with Menelaos forces an allegiance with Paris, whatever the audience thinks about him. In his grief-rage, Paris kills Euchenor (13.660–72). This description of Paris's success in battle, followed by the vivid summary that 'they fought like fiery fire' (ὡς οἱ μὲν μάρναντο δέμας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο, 13.673), finally leads the narrative back to Hektor.

Hektor/Panic: 13.674–837

After close to thirty-five minutes spent with Idomeneus and Meriones and the ensuing fight around them on the left flank, the narrative returns to Hektor. Even though the previous beat ends with Paris making a kill, the narrator switches audience alignment to Hektor, telling us that he does not know his men are dying on the left flank.¹³⁰ This transition tricks us slightly, reframing the recent scenes emphatically to increase the *pathos* that Hektor will have to respond to. This again engages the melodramatic alignment structure where Hektor will learn what other characters (and the audience) already know. The juxtaposition between Paris's success and Hektor's ignorance of the state of the rest of his troops also finds a clear repetition a couple of scenes later, when Hektor finds Paris on the battlefield.

The narrative finds Hektor still holding the line where he first broke through the gates, recapping the main action of the battle sequence in Book 12 (13.679f. recaps 12.462–71).¹³¹ The narrative elaborates that the point in the wall where Hektor broke through was the lowest point (does this tarnish Hektor's success slightly?), and nearest the ships of Aias and Protesilaos (13.682–5). In re-establishing this space, the narrative also provides a mini-catalogue that lists the

peoples fighting in it:¹³² the Boiotians, the Ionians, the Lokrians, the Phthians, and the Epeians all try to hold back Hektor, who is once again like a flame (φλογὶ εἵκελον, 13.688; cf. 13.53), but they cannot. The Athenians are also there, with Menestheus, Pheidias, Stichios, and Bias, and the Epeian leaders were Meges, Amphion, and Drakos, while the Phthians were led by Medon and Podarkes (13.689–93). These men are those who fight with the Aiantes against Hektor, with the Lokrians as bowmen and slingers in the rearguard (13.685–722). Against all these men, the Trojans forget their lust for war (13.721f.); a contrast with Menelaos's assertion that the Trojans were insatiable when it came to war at 13.635.

The narrative keeps the audience's alignment with the Trojans with a contrafactual that the Trojans would have run from the Achaian ships and shelters back to Troy, if Poulydamas had not spoken to Hektor, starting a new beat (13.723–5).¹³³ Poulydamas reintroduces himself, Hektor, and their relationship in his speech (he was last seen over seventy minutes ago, at 12.250). Poulydamas's speech raises several ambiguities around Hektor's character that will compel the audience to again re-think its allegiance with his character.

First Poulydamas says that Hektor is 'impossible' and will not listen (13.726); this recalls and judges Hektor's refusal to recognize Poulydamas's bird-sign interpretation from the previous episode, though there Hektor escaped comment (12.230–50). Then Poulydamas suggests that Hektor 'wants to be better in counsel than others' (καὶ βουλῆ ἑθέλεις περιίδμεναι ἄλλων, 13.728), problematizing Hektor's epithet of 'equal in counsel to Zeus's' (Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντε, 11.200 = 7.47). This forms part of Poulydamas's accusation that Hektor does not understand how the gods give certain gifts to certain people (13.729–34), akin to Paris's admonition to Hektor not to mock the gods' gifts (3.63–6). Then Poulydamas appraises the direness of the present situation (13.735–9) and advises Hektor to pull back to a rally point (13.740–4). From there, Poulydamas again puts forward two possibilities: the gods will let them fall on the Achaian ships or let them escape from the ships unharmed (13.742–4; cf. 12.67–74). The narrative allows audience access to Poulydamas when he explains that his advice comes out of his fear of an Achaian reprisal against yesterday's Trojan successes (13.744f.): this recalls the Trojan advance from 'yesterday's' battle scenes in Book 8, but comes into conflict with audience knowledge. Zeus, after all, said that *this* day was to be the worst for the Achaians (8.470–3), and promised Hektor the glory today (11.200–9). So an audience member would be challenged to remember what happened 'yesterday' and whether or not Poulydamas is right in claiming what he does here. Poulydamas then explains his look towards the past with the ominous thought of Achilles' future return: 'since a man who can't get enough of war stays

back by the ships, and I don't think he'll stay out of the fight much longer' (ἐπεὶ παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀνὴρ ἄτος πολέμοιο/ μίμνει, ὃν οὐκέτι πάγχυ μάχης σχήσεσθαι ὄϊω. 13.746f.). This builds on earlier predictions of Achilles' return, like the narrator's at 2.694 and Zeus's prophecy at 8.473–7, and once again stokes audience anticipation for Achilles to come back into action (and all that that entails).

Hektor is convinced. He jumps off his chariot and tells Poulydamas to hang back and call the troops to the rallying point, while he goes to meet the attack and order the men back (13.750–3). Hektor's enthusiasm to meet the attack here reinforces his earlier claim to Andromache that he has learned to always fight in the frontlines (6.445), even when the audience has seen that to not always be the case in today's battle (Zeus's intervention from 11.162–285; 11.359f.). Once he finishes his speech, Hektor runs 'like a snowy mountain' as he orders each man to make his way back to Poulydamas's rally point (13.754–7). The startling image of Hektor moving back into the battle as a snowy mountain picks up on earlier narrative comparisons of Hektor to whirlwinds and squalls (cf. 11.296–8; 11.305–10; 12.40). The idea of a moving mountain under its snowstorm feels much like a giant wave in a storm descending – both suggest mass and movement, rushing sound and blinding chaos – and in stormy seas, a high wave with its white-cap looks a lot like a snowy mountain bearing down on you.¹³⁴

Hektor's mission to rally the vanguard allows him to discover that many of the men he seeks are no longer fighting. Once again the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure creates opportunities for recap through diegetic retellings and character deepening through character responses to those retellings. Hektor cannot find Deiphobos, Helenos, Adamas, and Asios (13.758–61), and the narrative emphasizes the gap between his knowledge and audience experience as it reminds us that many of those men are dead by the Achaian ships while others have retreated with wounds to Troy (13.762–4).

Hektor finds Paris (13.766), whom the narrative left behind on the left flank after he killed Euchenor (13.660–72), just over ten minutes ago in the performance. Now Hektor finds Paris encouraging his troops to keep up the fight (13.766), creating continuity on either side of its cut to the centre flank in its portrait of Paris fighting hard. But Hektor rebukes Paris just the same, just as he had in Book 3 after fleeing Menelaos (13.768f. = 3.38f.). The rest of his reproach is more contextually appropriate, as Hektor asks his brother where all the Trojans have gone, listing them in the same order as the narrative had described in the previous beat (13.771–3, cf. 13.758–61): Deiphobos (wounded at 13.528–39), Helenos (wounded at 15.582–97), Adamas (killed, 13.560–9), Asios (killed, 13.384–93), with the addition of Othryoneus (13.772; he was killed

at 13.363–82). The mention of these men engages audience memory and challenges the audience as to whether *they* remember what has happened to the Trojans in this past battle sequence. Hektor ends on a note of sheer panic: ‘now all high Ilion will end, from its top down – now your sheer destruction’ (νῦν ὄλετο πᾶσα κατ’ ἄκρης/Ἰλιος αἰπεινή· νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος, 13.772–5). This plays on Hektor’s prior prediction of Troy’s fall at 6.447–65, and links his and Paris’s fate with that destruction.

Paris calmly defends his actions against Hektor’s rebuke (13.775–7): he jokes that his mother did not raise him to be altogether cowardly (13.777) and catches Hektor up on the fact that he has been fighting bravely all this time (νολεμέως, 13.780). Paris then recaps what has happened to the men Hektor asked for: they are all dead, all but Deïphobos and Helenos, who have escaped with wounds (13.780–3). Finally, Paris tells Hektor to lead, and he and the remaining men will follow. So Hektor’s mission from the previous beat (13.758–64) finds its resolution as the survivors on the left flank join those others who have gathered at the rally point (13.788f.).

The narrative keeps the audience attached to the brothers as they return to the Trojans (13.789). The narrative mentions Kebriones and Poulydamas first, as they are the most recognizable, before a slew of ‘new’ Trojans to fill in now that so many Trojan heroes have been wounded or killed (13.790–4).¹³⁵ Hektor leads them, the narrative reiterates, comparing him to Ares, describing the shield he carries and the helmet he wears (13.802–5). He charges everywhere, testing the Achaian lines, but never breaking through (13.806f.).

The narrative switches alignment to Aias, who steps forward to challenge Hektor. Aias tells Hektor that only Zeus beats the Achaians, and that Troy will fall long before the Trojans ever take the Achaian ships – soon the Trojans will be praying to Zeus as they run for their lives (13.810–20). The audience knows that Zeus will turn the Trojans back once Achilles rejoins the fight (8.470–6); Achilles himself has claimed that he will meet Hektor near his own ship, once Hektor has brought fire to their camp (9.650–5). In case the audience does not remember these instances, or has no knowledge of tradition, the narrator gives a new sign that Aias’s threats might come to pass, following his speech with a bird-sign that seems to confirm his predictions, as it makes the Achaians brave (13.821–3).

Then the narrative switches audience alignment to Hektor, who responds to Aias’s flying speech. In Hektor’s response, he expresses the strange wish/threat, that if only it were as likely for him to be called a son of Zeus and Hera as it were that today will bring evil to all the Argives (13.825–8).¹³⁶ This echoes Poseidon’s claim at the beginning of this ‘episode’, when he said that ‘Hektor claims to be a

son of Zeus's' (13.53f.).¹³⁷ The audience might guess that Hektor's surety comes from his faith in Zeus's promise (11.200–9). He goes on to say that Aias will die, and that the birds and dogs will feast on his fat and flesh (13.829–3); any traditional audience will know that this will not happen. The sides are now seemingly evenly matched, crying out as they come together once more in battle (13.832–7). Despite Hektor's victory at the wall (12.453–71), these last battle sequences in Book 13 have quite literally held him in place; fixed at the point where he broke through the Achaian battlements for much of the narrative, and discovering his men wounded or dead when he leaves that point. Still, the other characters have heaped interpretation on his character throughout the episode, calling him a mad man, thinking Aias can take him, thinking he is always eager for war but that he will be held. Hektor himself speaks little, in his counter-orders to Poulydamas as he goes to rally the left flank and in his wrongly-placed rebuke for Paris where he sees the fall of all of Troy. The audience is once again left to try to fit all these small, ill-fitting pieces together.

Achaians assemble (injury edition): 14.1–152

The scene switches when Nestor, drinking in the Achaian camp, hears the outcry from the clashing armies (14.1). As Book 13 would take just over an hour to perform, and since there are recaps throughout Book 14 of the previous 'episode', a performer could easily take a break in his performance here before the action cuts to Nestor. The beat sequences in Book 13 deepened many characters, including the Aiantes, Idomeneus, Meriones, Deïphobos, Helenos, and Hektor and Paris, but the plot has hardly advanced at all: the 'episode' begins and ends with Hektor just inside the Achaian wall and Aias checking him there. Tradition dictates that Aias cannot die in battle;¹³⁸ the needs of the story dictate that Hektor cannot die *yet*, so within this scenario, the narrator must sustain the stalemate, while keeping the audience engaged. Just as in the last episode, the narrative achieves this in part by moving from character to character, from location to location on the battlefield. Now the narrative expands this geography to include the Achaian camp (full of injured major characters) and the divine spheres. These scenes, away from the main battle, allow for diegetic retellings of the previous 'episode's' battlefield actions, while adding further depth to these characters and continuing to build anticipation for future events.

These techniques start with our move off of the battlefield back to the tent of Nestor, which the narrative left at least an hour and forty minutes ago (11.802).

The beat gives character continuity to Nestor's storyline, as it recaps that last scene in the tent, both in the narrative detail of finding Nestor still drinking wine (14.1), and in his speech. Here, Nestor reintroduces Machaon and Hekamede by name, and mentions again the wine, re-drawing the scene the narrator left behind (14.3–8 recaps 11.617–803). As Nestor leaves his tent, he sees the Achaians running, chased by the Trojans, and he sees that the Achaian wall has failed, recapping the end of battle sequence around the wall rather than the most recent sequence (14.13–15 recaps 12.462–71 *not* 13.833–7). This raises an issue of continuity and timing:¹³⁹ is this scene with Nestor concurrent with the end of Book 12? Or do the Trojans take the advantage *while* the narrator has shifted alignment to Nestor? Either way, while the last battle sequence ended on an apparent stalemate, seeing the Achaians on their back feet gives reason for Nestor to either return to battle or to seek out the other Achaians in the camp now (14.20–6).

The narrative attaches to Nestor as he decides to go after Agamemnon and here the narrative reintroduces the wounded Achaians (14.27–9), all absent since Book 11: Diomedes (11.396–400), Odysseus (11.463–88), and Agamemnon (11.264–74). Agamemnon asks Nestor why he has left the battle, before he says that he fears Hektor's threats coming true (14.44). Agamemnon specifically claims that Hektor made threats to the assembled Trojans against him (μοι, 14.44–7). This challenges audience memory. Did Agamemnon hear Hektor's great shout to the Trojans that he would jump the Achaian wall and set fire to the ships (8.173–83)? Has Hektor ever made a threat against Agamemnon specifically, the way that Agamemnon has made threats specifically against Hektor (2.412–18)? Is everything that Hektor has threatened coming to pass, as Agamemnon says (14.48)? Agamemnon finally worries the Achaians will no longer fight for him, if they are angered like Achilles, once again making reference to the events of Book 1 (14.49–51).

Nestor's response recaps that the wall has failed, and says once again that the fight has turned against the Achaians (14.52–63 recaps 14.13–15; cf. 12.462–71). Agamemnon attributes the Trojans' current success to Zeus and suggests once more that they should leave Troy (14.74–81; cf. 2.139–41, 9.26–8). Again, we see the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure in play, as Agamemnon's knowledge is only partially true. Zeus does support Hektor (11.186–209); but only insofar as keeping his promise to Thetis (13.347–50). Odysseus and Diomedes speak out against this plan, and the narrator cleverly uses this dialogue of long speeches to re-orient its audience to these characters after over two hours of performance without them: Diomedes left the battlefield at 11.400; Odysseus at 11.488.

Diomedes suggests that they return to battle even wounded as they are, and the men agree (14.110–34). Poseidon, too, re-emerges here as an Achaian ally. The narrative reintroduces Poseidon as ‘not having a blind-watch’, a callback to the beginning of Book 13, and a reminder to the audience that Zeus, in contrast, is *not* watching now (οὐδ’ ἀλαοσκοπιὴν εἶχε, 14.135; cf. 13.10). Poseidon also again disguises himself as an old man (cf. 13.355–7, 13.45, 13.216). He tells Agamemnon that Achilles must be happy with how things are going, but curses him (14.139–42) before reassuring Agamemnon that he will see the Trojans running away over the plain (14.144–6), creating audience expectation for a future Trojan rout.¹⁴⁰ Poseidon follows this speech with a huge battle-cry that throws strength into every Achaian’s heart to keep fighting (14.147–52). So the scene ends with one problem posed and resolved: the Achaians are on their back feet, and now the injured Achaian leaders will return to the fight as their reinforcements.

Hera: 14.153–360

The narrative switches audience alignment to Hera in the next beat, giving the audience access to her happiness when she sees Poseidon on the battlefield (14.153–6). This points back to Poseidon’s involvement through these last battle sequences as well as to Zeus’s earlier proclamation banning the gods’ interventions in the war (8.1–27). She then looks to Zeus, sitting on the peaks of Mount Ida (cf. 13.1–9), whom she thinks ‘hateful’ (στρυγρός, 14.158). Along with these emotional responses, the narrator also provides access to her plot to keep Zeus unaware of Poseidon’s interventions in the war: she will seduce Zeus, so that he will sleep (14.159–360). This access creates audience anticipation for the next beat sequence, which follows Hera as she executes this plot to keep Zeus’s assistance to the Trojans in check a while longer.

The beats that make up the seduction sequence echo beats from previous episodes: Hera ‘arms’ herself to prepare to seduce Zeus (14.166–223; cf. 11.17–44),¹⁴¹ an oath is taken between Hera and Sleep (14.270–9; cf. 3.375–94); Zeus even manages a catalogue, of his old lovers (14.317–27; cf. 2.487–760). All of these scenes are callbacks that can give the audience pleasure, as they recognize them in new contexts, remembering their standard narrative uses within the context of the *Iliad* while delighting in the narrator’s change of direction here.¹⁴² Serial television often engages in this strategy, relying on recontextualizing schema in its ‘callbacks’ to the delight of long-term audience members;¹⁴³ these can also be ‘ironic echoes’ or ‘internal homages.’¹⁴⁴ *Breaking Bad* (AMC, 2008–

13) particularly engaged in this strategy, in part to emphasize the extraordinary shift in Walter White's character over the course of the series.¹⁴⁵

While Hera's mission includes these kinds of callbacks, her sub-plot also moves the main plot forward, as Zeus's falling asleep means that Poseidon is freer to help the Achaians even more. The sequence ends by following Sleep back to the battlefield to urge Poseidon on in his aiding the Achaians (14.352–60), bringing back Poseidon's central role in the battle sequences of Book 13.¹⁴⁶ And as Poseidon exhorts the Achaians, he brings our attention once more to Hektor.

Hektor/Aias: 14.361–439

There has been about a half hour of performance time (and a likely break) since Hektor was last seen in action (13.834), and over twenty minutes since last anyone mentioned him (Agamemnon, back at 14.44). These long absences of Hektor's fit into the *Iliad's* serial narrative strategy of keeping audience investments diffuse across many characters while building up to the main events that the epic has pointed to: Patroklos's death, Achilles' return to battle, and Hektor's death. So the narrative always holds Hektor at arm's length away from us, then brings him close for just moments, and then pushes him back away, until his death-day comes. Otherwise, this would not be an epic, it would be a tragedy. The *Iliad* is no tragedy.¹⁴⁷

After this absence, Poseidon's exhortation reintroduces Hektor with his name and his role as Priam's son (14.364f.). He repeats Hektor's goal to take the ships while Achilles remains off the battlefield (14.365–7; cf. 8.173–83). But Poseidon says the Achaians can manage without Achilles and that he does not think Hektor will be able to stand up against them for long, even though he is very eager (14.368–75). Idomeneus said something similar about Hektor in the last episode, confident enough to leave the Aiantes to fight Hektor (13.315–27; μάλα περ μεμαῶτα at 14.375 = 13.317). Poseidon's speech sets up the possibility of Hektor's failure against the Achaians in the next battle sequence.

As the audience's alignment switches to the Achaians, the narrator reiterates that the wounded Diomedes, Odysseus, and Agamemnon are now marshalling their men; this re-naming encourages investment in the Achaian heroes as they move into battle (14.379f.). The narrative then switches sides so that the audience aligns with Hektor ordering the Trojans (14.388); then the narrative zooms out to show both Poseidon and Hektor as 'helpers' to their sides (ἀρήγων, 14.391).

This sets up a strange parallel considering that Poseidon is a god, Hektor just a mortal.¹⁴⁸ So the fight seems set, between Diomedes, Odysseus, Agamemnon, and Poseidon on one side, and Hektor on the other.

Suddenly, the narrative reintroduces Aias into the fray (last seen at 13.824, around a half hour ago without breaks), starting a new line with his name as the indirect object as Hektor makes his spear-cast against him (14.402–5). While the past several scenes have been carefully building up to a new battle sequence, and a showdown between the returning Achaians or Poseidon and Hektor, this picks up instead on the dangling end of Book 13, and provides the combat between Aias and Hektor here that their speech exchange suggested last ‘episode’ (13.810–32).

The narrative follows Hektor’s thrown spear as it strikes at Aias’s chest but does not pierce the skin, protected as it is by two broad straps (14.402–6). Hektor, discouraged, goes to run back to his companions to avoid death (14.406–8), but Aias strikes him with a stone (14.409–20). The narrative describes the stone as one of those ‘holders of the ships’ (ἔχματα νηῶν, 14.410), a reminder of how close this fighting is to the Achaian ships, but also a telling note about the size of the stone. The blow downs Hektor, like an oak struck by Zeus’s lightning (14.414–17),¹⁴⁹ perhaps an oblique reference to Zeus’s now-lacking support. But the narrator lists a mini-catalogue of the Trojans who rush to his aid (Aineias, Poulydamas, Agenor, Sarpedon, and Glaukos, 14.424–6), many of whom we have not seen since a previous ‘episode’. The narrator introduced *only* Hektor of all the Trojans before the fight; now it foregrounds these other fighters in anticipation of this injury keeping Hektor off the field.

The men all protect Hektor on the battlefield – not just those named, but every one of his men (14.427). This extraordinary response in Hektor’s vulnerable moment builds further allegiance to Hektor, because these men have such care for him. Hektor’s men work to get him off the field, bundling him into a chariot and taking him to rest beside the river Xanthos. There, Hektor’s eyes clear for a moment, but he vomits up a blood clot, and the darkness mists once more over his eyes,¹⁵⁰ his strength still spent (14.433–9). This emphasis on the seriousness of the wound not only builds up *pathos* for Hektor, but it also gives the narrator sufficient justification to remove Hektor from the battlefield for a substantial amount of time, prolonging our anticipation for his eventual confrontations with Patroklos and Achilles (predicted at 8.470–5). The Achaians see Hektor’s withdrawal and rally (14.440f.).¹⁵¹ So the argument of Hektor’s success or failure implicit in Poseidon’s earlier speech resolves (14.374f.), as Hektor *cannot* hold the line.

Battle: 14.440–507

The Argives regain their lust for battle and the battle sequence begins, where the narrative rapidly switches audience alignment between sides, following a perception/emotion response to a death or a vaunt over a death that prompts a retaliatory strike that often misses its original target.¹⁵² Oïlean Aias kills Satnios (14.443–8), and Poulydamas kills Prothoënor and vaunts (14.449–57); the Argives are sad at his vaunting (14.458), especially Telamonian Aias, who aims at Poulydamas but hits Archelochos (14.459–69); Aias vaunts (14.469–74); the Trojans feel sorrow at his vaunting (14.475), Akamas stabs Promachos (14.476f.), vaunts; the Argives grieve over his vaunting (14.486), Peneleos charges Akamas but kills Ilioneus and vaunts (14.489–500).¹⁵³ Finally, the narrative zooms out to show all men trying to escape death (ἕκαστος ὄπη φύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον, 14.507). This scene, with its flurry of back and forth between the Achaians and the Trojans – five deaths in less than five minutes – serves Hektor well as an emphasis on the vacuum that his absence creates on the battlefield.

When Zeus wakes: 14.508–15.86

When the narrative pauses to ask the Muses to tell him whom the Achaians killed with Poseidon's help (14.508–10), this signals a shift in the pattern: no more back and forth, no more 'every man wanted to escape'. Now the narrator strongly aligns the audience with the Achaian side. And now the deaths come even faster: Telamonian Aias kills Hyrtios (14.511f.); Antilochos kills Phalkes and Mermeros (14.513); Meriones, Morys and Hippotion (14.513); Teukros, Periphetes and Prothoön (14.515); Menelaos, Hyperenor (14.516–19). And Oïlean Aias killed the most (πλείστους δ' Αἴας εἶλεν Ὀϊλῆος, 14.520), since he was fast going after the men that Zeus terrified (14.520–2). That comes to eight named deaths in eleven lines, under one minute of performance time. The whole battle sequence is terribly familiar in its components, but the narrative condenses it this time round, to avoid too much repetition.¹⁵⁴ The last great battle sequence from Book 13 took close to twenty-five minutes of performance time (13.330–673); this one takes just six.

This kill list ends with the narrator aligning the audience with Oïlean Aias, who kills the most men, 'since there was no one like him, with his feet, to chase after/ running men, when Zeus urged them to flight' (οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπισπέσθαι ποσὶν ἦεν/ ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, ὅτε τε Ζεὺς ἐν φόβον ὄρη, 14.521f.). This mention of Zeus invites audience engagement, asking if they

remember that Zeus was sleeping last time we saw him (14.359, just over ten minutes ago), all part of Hera's plan. The mention does, also, though, anticipate his waking from his slumber, and his future involvement in the battle:¹⁵⁵ he will, in fact, wake up in the very next beat.¹⁵⁶

The transition from Book 14 to Book 15 presents some ambiguity as to whether or not it would allow for a performance break, as the action is continuous and the narrative does not mention the fleeing Trojans by name on either side of any possible break.¹⁵⁷ It is more likely that a break could come just before the last list of Achaian kills, with the invocation of the Muses (14.508): this would assert Achaian dominance in the wake of Zeus's non-intervention, and would so present the problem developed in the last beat sequence for Zeus's waking up to respond to. Likewise, Zeus's waking up and his subsequent intervention provide ample opportunities for recapping the events of the previous 'episode'. Zeus's returned attention to the Trojan conflict will also finally push the plot forward after the narrative has maintained a wonderfully character-rich 'stalemate' for close to two hours of performance time.

So now the Trojans make it back over the Achaian ditch (unnamed, so in continuous action, fleeing from Oilean Aias at 14.521f.), but 'many' were beaten down at the hands of the Danaans (15.1–4); this fulfils Poulydamas's implied warning from before the Trojan attack on the wall and his bird-sign interpretation (12.70–4; 12.216–27). As they pull up their chariots on the other side of the ditch, terrified, Zeus wakes up. The narrator aligns the audience with Zeus as his perceptions recap the end of the last 'episode': he *sees* the Achaians driving forward with Poseidon, sees the Trojans running away (ἴδε, 15.6–8). And then, he *sees* Hektor lying on the plain, surrounded by his companions (Ἔκτορα δ' ἐν πεδίῳ ἴδε κείμενον, ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι/ εἴαθ', 15.9f.; cf. 14.424–39). The fact that Hektor's companions remain around him as he lies injured adds to Zeus's pity response, which the narrative provides access to (τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ἐλέησε, 15.12). Again, Hektor is refracted through the characters around him and their care for him demands that the audience question their own allegiance to the fallen man (cf. 14.424–32).

The narrator then gives the audience access to Zeus's pity for Hektor, which is matched by his anger for Hera: he recaps her deception that allowed Hektor to suffer this way (15.14f. and 15.31–3 recaps 14.161–353) before violently threatening her and reminding her of past punishments (15.16–30). If Zeus's pity invites an audience to question their own feelings for Hektor, so does this anger: it constructs Hektor as someone who should be not just protected, but avenged. Hera swears that she has not been helping Poseidon against Hektor and the Trojans (15.36–46). Hera's oath asks audience members to try to remember

what really happened in the previous ‘episode’: while Sleep does tell Poseidon about their plot (14.353–60), and Poseidon does help the Achaians all the more for it (14.361f.), there is no direct evidence that Hera ordered Sleep to urge Poseidon on.¹⁵⁸ So Hera swears true and even offers to tell Poseidon to get in line (15.45f.). This offer wins Zeus over (15.49–2).

Zeus’s response to Hera once again maps out future narrative events,¹⁵⁹ this time with much more detail than in Book 8, now over five hours ago in performance time (8.473–6). If Hera has told the truth, Zeus says, then she should go and order Iris to tell Poseidon to stop his help for the Achaians (15.49–62) and tell Apollo to help Hektor with his injury (15.59–62). This mission builds audience anticipation for events in the next beats. But Zeus also uses this speech to elaborate on his earlier prophecy as he lays out events still to come in the epic: Hektor, with Apollo’s help, will drive the Trojans up to the ships of Achilles (15.59–64), then Patroklos will kill many (15.66), including Sarpedon (15.67),¹⁶⁰ until Hektor kills Patroklos (15.65), and then, angry over Patroklos, Achilles will kill Hektor (15.68).¹⁶¹ Then the battle will always head away from the ships until Troy itself falls (15.69–71). With this foretold, Zeus ends his speech reiterating that he will keep all the gods away from helping the Achaians, until he fulfils his promise to Thetis (15.73–5 recaps 1.518–30). This beat predicting Hektor’s death, following immediately the beat where Zeus sees and pities the wounded Hektor, compounds any audience allegiance for the Trojan hero.

Other gods: 15.87–149

The audience remains attached to Hera as she return to Olympos with her mission to find Apollo and Iris. Here again, the epic’s melodramatic alignment structure comes into play, in the gap between what she knows, what the audience knows, and what the other gods know. After she complains to Themis about Zeus sending evils against all the gods (15.104–9), Hera announces the death of Ares’ son Askalaphos (15.110–2). This terrifically manipulative move by Hera recaps Deïphobos killing Askalaphos (13.516–20), where the narrator had emphasized Ares’ ignorance of his son’s death (13.521–5). That was almost seventy minutes ago of performance time (without breaks). Ares naturally wants to return to the battlefield to avenge his son (15.115–18), and nearly does, but Athena prevents him (15.119–42). Athena reassures him with the terrible truth: some other man, better than Askalaphos, has died since his death, or will soon die (15.139f.). ‘It’s hard to save the race of men, and their offspring’ (ἀργαλέον δὲ/ πάντων

ἀνθρώπων ῥύσθαι γενεὴν τε τόκον τε. 15.140f.). So Ares' action goes nowhere, but the beat importantly shows the investment of the gods in individual heroes on the battlefield, building on earlier beats that showed Zeus's strong feelings for the wounded Hektor (15.12f.), and his foretelling the death of his own son Sarpedon (15.67). It also shows the limits of that investment, playing on the previous scene's truth that as much as Zeus might feel for his son, or for Hektor, he will still watch them die to fulfil his promise to another god (15.49–77). After this exchange, Hera completes the mission that Zeus set for her, pulling Iris and Apollo aside to send them to find Zeus on Mount Ida, resolving one 'mission' while putting another in motion (15.143–9).

Apollo/Hektor: 15.150–270

The narrative aligns the audience with Iris and Apollo as they go to Mount Ida to find Zeus, but each then gets their own beat sequence in which Zeus gives them their orders and they carry them out: Zeus is happy to see them because they obeyed his wife, recapping two scenes prior (15.155f.). First, Zeus sends Iris to stop Poseidon from helping the Achaians, which he reluctantly agrees to do on the condition that Troy still fall (15.157–217). After this, Zeus orders Apollo to support Hektor against the Achaians.¹⁶² This recaps and further elaborates what we have seen in the previous scenes, as Zeus tells Apollo to take care of Hektor and give him battle-fury, at least until the Achaians run away to their ships (15.231–3). Then Zeus will decide what to do next, and give new orders (15.234f.). This looks forward to a resurgent Hektor, but leaves some ambiguity as to how long his resurgence will last: when will the Trojans finally reach the ships? Zeus does not tell Apollo that Hektor will die. Does Apollo know?

The narrative keeps the audience attached to Apollo as he goes down to Hektor. The narrative has kept audience alignment with the gods through these last several beats: Hektor has only been spoken of as a pawn in their plans. But now the narrative attaches the audience to Hektor once again (15.239–42). The scene paints a perfect picture of continuity since the narrator left the wounded Hektor: now he sits, 'no longer' lying down (οὐδ' ἔτι, 15.240; cf. 14.436–9). While the audience has been elsewhere, Hektor has begun to recover. Apollo asks him why he sits apart from the others (15.243–5), providing Hektor with opportunity to recap his injury from Book 14 in his own terms. Like Achilles' recap to Thetis in Book 1, Hektor's recap here might contain a bit of metapoetic humour, as he recognizes Apollo as a god, and asks him 'don't you know?' (οὐκ ἄνεις, 15.248).

The god *should* know; the audience certainly does. Then Hektor recaps Aias hitting him with the stone by the ships (15.248–50 recapping 14.409–20). But the narrator gives the audience access to Hektor here, too, as he tells Apollo that he thought that today he was joining the halls of the dead (15.251f.). That Hektor himself thought that he would die confirms the narrative's description of the gravity of his injuries (14.411–39), and in coming into line with what a seemingly reliable narrator has said, Hektor shows himself a realist. But at the same time, the narrative uses that terrible gap between what Hektor knows and what the audience knows: everyone has heard Zeus predict Hektor's death (15.68), so to see Hektor, so relieved to have come so close to death and to have escaped, creates a dreadful irony.¹⁶³ That irony only continues as Apollo reveals himself to Hektor as 'such a helper sent from Zeus on Mount Ida to stand by and defend' Hektor (τοῖόν τοι ἄοσητήρα Κρονίων/ ἔξ' Ἰδης προέηκε παρεστάμεναι καὶ ἀμύνειν, 15.254f., 15.254–7 recaps 15.221–35);¹⁶⁴ Apollo cannot, and will not, protect Hektor forever. But for now, Apollo looks to the next beat, and tells Hektor to drive the horses against the Achaian ships and that he will smooth the way (15.258–61). So Hektor returns to battle, full of great battle-fury from Apollo, prancing like a stallion the same way that Paris did making his way back to battle through the streets of Troy (15.263–8 = 6.506–11).

Battle again: 15.271–389

Just as with Hektor, the narrative creates the illusion of continuity for the Achaian troops, as 'up until then they were always' in a crowd stabbing the Trojans (15.277f.), but when they see Hektor, they become terrified (15.279f.). As the battle begins, the narrative uses the techniques now expected in a battle sequence, and any recognition of these patterns on the audience's part can provide some pleasure. The narrative identifies and attaches the audience to multiple active characters within the battle as it rapidly switches audience alignment between the two sides.

Audience alignment starts with Thoas, who recaps Hektor's injury again (15.286–9 recapping 14.409–39): much like Hektor himself, Thoas says that he thought Aias had killed Hektor (15.286–9; cf. 15.251f.). Thoas recognizes that the gods have restored Hektor but, like others before him, feels sure that the Achaians can rally and keep Hektor off the ships (15.295–9; cf. Idomeneus at 13.315–20, Aias at 14.374–7). Again the narrative uses the gap between Thoas's knowledge and audience knowledge to stoke interest, as Zeus has said that Hektor will reach

the ships (8.473–6, 15.231–3). This ambiguity keeps the audience engaged around the issue of what exactly will happen when Hektor arrives at the ships.

The narrator lists another mini-catalogue to signal to the audience which main Achaian characters will feature in this battle sequence: Aias, Idomeneus, Teukros, Meriones, Meges (15.301–3). These are the men who will face Hektor and the Trojans (15.304). The narrative then switches audience alignment to Hektor and Apollo with the aegis (15.306–11), before switching back to the Achaians (15.312), and then the battle begins (15.313–19). Only Apollo, staring into the eyes of the Achaians, jolts the narrative out of balance, swinging it in the Trojans' favour (15.320–7). The narrative gives a catalogue of Trojan kills; starting with Hektor first, who kills Stichios and Arkesilaos; then Aineias kills Medon and Iasos; then Poulydamas, Mekisteus; Polites, Echios; Agenor, Klonios; Paris comes last, killing Deïchos as he runs away (15.331–42). These deaths come faster than ever: eight deaths in less than a minute. The narrator knows that by now, his audience recognizes these patterns, and he is careful not to weary them.

As the Trojans strip bodies, the Achaians run across the ditch (15.343–5). In a callback to an earlier battle sequence, Hektor tells the Trojans to leave the bodies be as they run for the ships (15.347; cf. Nestor at 6.67–71), and then he threatens death for any man who flees, and that he will leave that man's body to the dogs (15.348–51, cf. Agamemnon at 2.391–3). A traditional audience, or an audience that would at least be familiar with the treatment that Hektor's own corpse will receive from Achilles, will sense this narrative irony around Hektor and the treatment of corpses.¹⁶⁵

Hektor's exhortation works, and the next beat keeps the audience attached to the Trojans as they successfully overrun the Achaian battlements again with the help of Apollo (15.352–66).¹⁶⁶ The narrator especially aligns the audience with Apollo, saying his name twice in this short passage (15.355, 15.360), before addressing him directly (15.365), bringing us closer to Apollo.¹⁶⁷ The next beat sees the audience's alignment switch to the Achaians and Nestor, who prays to Zeus to save the Achaians from the Trojan advance (15.370–6), and Zeus thunders, 'hearing Nestor's prayer' (15.378). The Trojans hear it too, and both sides fight all the harder for it (15.379–89).

Patroklos: 15.390–405

In this chaos, the narrator cuts back to Patroklos, who has been treating Eurypylos in his tent while the Trojans have been overrunning the Achaians

(15.390–4). This recaps where the narrator last left Patroklos, back at 11.847, about two and a half hours ago, and creates a strong sense of Patroklos's character continuity for the audience. The space that Patroklos is in, the fact that he is with Eurypylos, and that he is still applying medicines to the other man's wounds all provide memory cues for the audience. But when Patroklos realizes that the Trojans are near the ships, he tells Eurypylos he must leave him behind to find Achilles and persuade him to return to the fight (15.399–404), reasserting and resuming his previously side-tracked mission that Nestor sent him on before he encountered Eurypylos (11.791–3; 15.403f.=11.792f.). That mission gains new meaning so soon after Zeus's prediction of Patroklos's death (15.65), especially if the audience remembers that Nestor also suggested Patroklos himself enter battle (11.795–802). Now, wheels are in motion to start hitting those signposts of future events that have been laid out in previous episodes.

Hektor/Aias: 15.406–591

With Patroklos running back to Achilles, the narrator switches scenes back to the battlefield, where he once again begins to rapidly change audience alignment between sides and characters. The narrator tells us again that other groups are fighting elsewhere, giving the impression of a vast battle that he can only show us one small part of (15.414 = 12.175). The first characters that the narrative zooms in on are Hektor and Aias, still in stalemate: Aias cannot drive Hektor off his ship, with Apollo helping him, but Hektor cannot take the ship either (15.414–9). Aias strikes Hektor with his spear (15.419–21). The narrative switches audience alignment to Hektor, who sees Hektor fall, and the narrator says that Hektor and Hektor are cousins: this builds audience anticipation for Hektor to respond and builds greater emotional impact for that response (15.422–4). Hektor rallies his men to stand their ground and to protect Hektor's fallen body (15.425–8).

As Hektor finishes his speech, the scene switches audience alignment again, following his spear-cast at Aias, which misses, but strikes Lykophron instead. The narrative gives the audience access to Aias as he shudders at the sight of Lykophron falling, and turns to Teukros. Aias's speech explains his grief response – Lykophron was his companion – and recaps Hektor's killing him, while implicitly urging Teukros to try to strike Hektor (15.437–41 recaps 15.433f.). So the structure of this scene is quite similar to the last in that a man falls, a relation

sees and responds by exhorting another.¹⁶⁸ But they are done quite differently, with Hektor's response both more private (he does not reveal his relationship to Kaletor) and public (he exhorts all of the men) than Aias's response.

The next beat sequence shows the impact and irony of Zeus's helping Hektor now that he is back in the action. First the narrative shows Teukros hitting the Trojan Kleitos, Poulydamas's companion, and Poulydamas must then save his horses (15.445–52). Then Teukros tries for Hektor with his bow. In a contrafactual, the narrator says that *without* Zeus's 'guarding Hektor', Teukros would have hit him and ended the fighting by the Achaian ships (15.459–62); then the narrative shows Zeus breaking the bow (15.463–5); finally, Teukros himself blames a god for the bow's breaking, when he complains to Aias (15.466–70). Aias confirms that a god has broken Teukros's bow, and tells him to get his spear and shield and keep fighting (15.471–7). So Teukros goes to get a spear (15.478–83).

Hektor sees Teukros's bow and arrow fail (15.484f.) and draws attention to Zeus's help against Teukros, and support for the Trojans in his exhortation to his men (15.486–93). This strong emphasis on Zeus's intervention creates irony in the gap between the audience's knowledge and Hektor's, as the audience knows that Zeus's help will end in Hektor's death (15.63–8). This makes the rest of Hektor's speech especially painful as he talks of battle death to his men:¹⁶⁹

ἀλλὰ μάχεσθ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἀολλέες, ὃς δέ κεν ὑμέων
βλήμενος ἢε τυπεὶς θάνατον καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπῃ
τεθνάτω· οὐ οἱ ἀεικέες ἀμυνομένῳ περὶ πάτρης
τεθνάμεν· ἀλλ' ἄλοχός τε σὴ καὶ παῖδες ὅπισσω,
καὶ οἶκος καὶ κληρὸς ἀκήρατος, εἴ κεν Ἀχαιοὶ
οἴχωνται σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν.

'So let's fight together round the ships and any one of us who finds death and destiny through some throw or strike, let him die because it's fitting for one defending his fatherland to die. But after, your wife and your children and your house and your land will stay untouched, if the Achaians leave with their ships for their fatherland.'

Hektor to Trojans, 15.494–9

In justifying the deaths of his own men in Troy's defence, Hektor unwittingly justifies his own impending death. More, the audience knows that none of these men's deaths will save their wives, or their children, or their city. Troy will burn to the ground. Hektor himself predicted the fall of Troy, and the capture of their

wives (6.446–65): this makes his speech all the more painful to hear now. Hektor's rhetoric here is the highest that we have seen, painting a struggle that goes beyond any of their individual lives on the battlefield, as anyone's death might mean that their families, their community can continue. Hektor's speech raises the stakes and plays with irony in ways that creates more audience anticipation as the battle continues. The narrative reinforces these higher stakes when it switches the audience's alignment to show Aias's exhortation to the Achaians.¹⁷⁰ Aias is more direct: he tells his men that they must choose to either live or die because if their ships fall to Hektor no one will escape alive (15.502–13). In both men's exhortations, just as in Zeus's plan, just as in the narrative as a whole now, death looms in the foreground.

The action in the next scene reinforces the stakes on both sides as it flips back and forth between them. Hektor and Aias are respectively first of their sides to get their men (15.515–7). Poulydamas kills Otos, Meges' companion (15.518f.); in response, Meges kills Kroismos (15.520–3), and Dolops and Menelaos kill Meges (15.524–43). Hektor responds by shaming Melanippos for letting the Achaians strip Dolops's body (15.545–58). Here Hektor changes the choice that he put before the Trojans just a few minutes earlier, from 'die and save your city' to: 'either we'll kill them or they'll sack Troy from the top down and kill its citizens' (πρίν γ' ἢ κατακτάμεν ἢ κατακρήσθαι Ἰλίον αἰπεινὴν ἐλέειν κτάσθαι τε πολίτας, 15.557f.).¹⁷¹ This echoes Hektor's panic in the battle sequence in Book 13, where he told Paris that all of Troy will be destroyed from the top down (κατακρήσθαι Ἰλίον αἰπεινὴν 13.772f. = 15.557f.); but the context here shows Hektor's determination, and the narrative confirms that 'he led them' (15.560). Hektor's 'kill or be killed' also picks up on Aias's own exhortation just a few minutes earlier (15.502–13).

So now once again the narrative switches the audience's alignment to Aias, who shames his men and urges them to cooperate in battle so that more of them might live (15.561–4): a constructive suggestion that looks back to Hektor's first speech (the many before the one). As the Achaians pull together, Zeus sends the Trojans against them again (15.567). But seeming to heed Aias's advice, Menelaos urges Antilochos to rush forward to attack the Trojans (15.568–71); Antilochos runs and kills Melanippos, rushing against him to strip his armour. Here the narrator addresses Melanippos's corpse (ἐπὶ σοὶ Μελάνιππε, 15.582) as Antilochos charges the body to strip it (15.582–4).¹⁷² The narrator tells Melanippos that Hektor has not forgotten him, and Hektor rushes in, sending Antilochos flying back to his companions (15.585–91). This is a marvellous manoeuvre of attachment, as the narrator very closely aligns the audience with

the fallen Melanippos through this sequence, to construct the feeling of Hektor saving the day that much more strongly.

Overhaul: 15.592–746

As the Trojans and Hektor race after the fleeing Achaians, fulfilling Zeus's plan (15.92f.), the narrative switches audience alignment to Zeus, who keeps rousing great battle-fury in the Trojans, while bewildering the Achaians and stealing their glory (15.594f.). The narrative provides the audience access to Zeus that recaps his intentions: he wants to honour Hektor until he sets a ship on fire, so Zeus can fulfil his promise to Thetis, but then he will drive the Trojans back and give the Achaians the glory (15.596–602 recaps 15.59–77; cf. 1.523–7). So Zeus drives on Hektor, who changes under Zeus's influence. The audience has seen Hektor very eager to fight on his own (15.604; cf. 13.317, 14.375). But now, with Zeus driving him, Hektor rages, his mouth starts to foam, his eyes flash and his helmet thunders with his raging (15.605–9). The narrative overhauls Hektor with these intense external, visual markers.¹⁷³ As Hektor becomes something different before our eyes, the narrator says that Zeus honours Hektor alone because he will soon die (*μυυυθάδιος*, 15.612),¹⁷⁴ emphasizing the special relationship between Zeus and Hektor that prior beat sequences set up (cf. 11.163f., 11.185–94, 15.4–12). At the same time, the narrator shows the audience the terrible irony of Hektor's last successes. The narrator here elaborates on prior knowledge that Hektor will die at the Achaians' hands (8.358f.), specifically Achilles' (15.68), and now adds Athena as Hektor's killer, too (15.613f.).

Through the next beat sequence, the narrative continues the back-and-forth between Hektor and Aias: even in his fullest glory, Hektor cannot completely beat back the great Achaian defender. And just as the narrator has raised the stakes through these two characters' speeches – both men adamantly exhorting their men that the war's outcome depends on this day's fighting – the narrative uses densely layered techniques to heighten the tension. Here, as Hektor rushes against the Achaian ships, the narrator describes him with a rapid series of extended similes. First, the Achaians are like towering cliffs holding up against the raging seas and wind (15.617–21); then Hektor is lit all round with fire (15.623); he is like a squall blowing against a ship at sea (15.623–8; cf. 11.296–8, 11.305–10, 12.40); finally, he is like a ravenous lion among a herd of oxen (15.630–6, cf. 15.592). But after all this, Hektor kills only one man: Periphetes, who trips and falls before him because Hektor gets the greater glory

(15.645–52).¹⁷⁵ The Achaians cannot help Periphetes because they are terrified of Hektor (αὐτοὶ γὰρ μάλα δειδίσαν' Ἐκτορα διόν, 15.652).

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with the Argives as they retreat back to their shelters. Here, Nestor supplicates each man, with a poignant appeal for men to remember their families and their property (15.661–6); this is a callback to Hektor's own appeal to his men, whose city is under siege (15.496–9). But Nestor's speech has its own irony as his men's families and property are not under siege, but absent (οὐ παρεόντων, 15.665). Seemingly in response to Nestor's appeal, Athena pushes the darkness from the men's eyes, and they point out Hektor, with his great war-cry (15.671f.; cf. 13.123) and his companions, re-establishing recognition for his character.

After this recognition, the narrative aligns the audience with Aias as he strides forward with a huge pike, significantly twice as long as Hektor's already twice-described long spear (15.678; cf. 6.319, 8.494). So Aias rallies the Achaians to the ships' defence, while Hektor keeps attacking like an eagle into a flock of birds (15.690–2), pushed always by Zeus's large hand (15.694f.). Zeus's direct intervention here once again reinforces his close connection with Hektor through this last battle sequence, supporting him though he is soon to die (15.612; cf. 11.163–5, 15.59–68).

The narrator makes a rare aside as it zooms out from the action, using a second person verb, 'you would think/say' (φαίης, 15.697),¹⁷⁶ when describing the tirelessness of the men facing off against each other in battle, inviting the audience to think of themselves *as* narrators in imagining these men, for a brief moment (15.697f.). Then the narrator gives the audience access into the motivations of both sides, recapping information from past scenes and building anticipation: the Achaians think they cannot escape from this terror, but must die (15.699f.); the Trojans hope to set fire to the ships and to kill the Achaian heroes (15.701f.). These stacked techniques for creating vividness and connection to the audience through apostrophe and access to the mind-states of those characters on the battlefield perfectly sets up the climax of the battle sequence, as in the very next line, Hektor grabs hold of the prow of a sea-faring ship (15.704). The ship is not just any ship, but that of Protesilaos, the cleverly named first Achaian to die on the shore of Troy (2.695–709), bringing a whole traditional history into this important moment.¹⁷⁷

As the scene unfolds, the narrator uses temporal adverbs ('not yet') to force us to think of the stalemate that has held the centre of the battle for so long, primarily around Aias and Hektor, but hosting a whole slew of secondary characters;¹⁷⁸ it has been around two and a half hours of performance time

(without breaks) since Hektor first broke through the gates of the Achaian ramparts back at 12.465f. Throughout this battle sequence, the narrative has consistently succeeded in raising the stakes for both sides, focusing the concerns of each side through Hektor and Aias, respectively. And while it has been several hours since Zeus first granted Hektor the glory (in the scenes between 11.186–290, close to four hours ago), the narrative has masterfully suspended Zeus's fulfilment of that promise.

Stuck in the middle with you

In these middle books, many things happen, but few things change. Through these middle books, and long battle sequences, the *Iliad's* melodramatic alignment structure allows the narrative to stretch in almost every direction but forwards. From one point of view, nothing at all has happened in these last seven or more hours of performance time. They started with a draw between Hektor and Aias; they end the same way. They start with the Trojans fighting nearer the ships than ever before; they end the same way. A wall is built, and breached. Achilles remains, as ever, apart. But the world and all its characters have become so much the richer for this time spent in it, and with them.

Hektor remains through these books much more at the forefront of battle than he was before his trip to Troy, but he still weaves in and out of the narrative: there is true narrative strategy in building investment in him before unleashing him on the battlefield. Once Hektor is on the field, the narrative provides many new perspectives on the Trojan hero, from companions (like Poulydamas), enemies (like Aias or Idomeneus) and from the gods themselves (like Poseidon). Yet at the intersection of all these perspectives, Hektor remains elusive: the narrator constantly plays with his recognition, alignment, and allegiance that the epic's early books worked so hard to construct. The narrator overhauls Hektor many times, portrays him as a mad man (13.53), a rabid dog (8.299), Gorgon-eyed (8.348f.), a slatherer (15.605–9), a night-faced force like fire (12.463–6). But through these sequences the audience also sees shows his vulnerabilities and his concerns: he is injured so badly that he nearly dies (14.409–39), and on different occasions the audience can see how much his men and his people care for him, and what his men and city, in turn, mean to him.

This 'middle' also provides its audience with a map towards Hektor's death. Of course the traditional audience will have already known that Hektor dies, and a practised audience might have guessed it from his time in Troy in Book 6. But

through these middle books, from Zeus's first prophecy that Achilles will check Hektor when he reaches the ships (8.470–83) to the narrator's note that Hektor's death-day fast approaches (15.612), now there can be no doubt that Hektor will die. And while that fact does not change *Hektor*, for those who know that Hektor will die, whether it be the narrator, Zeus, or the audience, it changes *us*, in how we think of Hektor. Everything now that he says or does will be judged, at least in part, against the knowledge that he will soon die. It becomes, for better or worse, a part of him.

Ends

The transition between Book 15 and Book 16 might not qualify for most as the beginning of the end of the *Iliad*,¹ but it is the beginning of the end for Hektor. The first books of the *Iliad* build the storyworld and introduce most of its many characters. The middle books point towards major events, while keeping the narrative in balance. In exploiting and expanding its melodramatic alignment structure, the narrative spends this time deepening familiar characters and introducing new ones, building audience alignment and allegiance with many of them. These final books finally let the major events pointed to in earlier episodes happen to those characters whom the narrative has built audience allegiance with; this allegiance means that those events will have emotional consequences for the audience. Hektor has now reached the ships (15.704–46). Patroklos has run to fetch Achilles to battle (15.390–405). The wheels are in motion, rolling towards events that have already been spelled out. Sarpedon will die (15.66f.). Patroklos will die (15.65). Achilles will return to battle, and he will kill Hektor (15.68).

These ‘ends’ affect how an audience builds allegiance with any given character, but they do nothing to dampen the curiosity of how the narrative will arrive at them.² If anything, knowing an ending builds *more* intense engagement and curiosity than not knowing. Many serial narratives rely on this fact, and will give an ‘end’ first, in order to set the challenge to its audience of picking up puzzle pieces along the way that might lead to that end. Consider the opening beat of *Hannibal’s* second season. The show is based on Thomas Harris’s novels, which have also received multiple film adaptations, so, like the *Iliad*, it also has a ‘traditional’ audience. That audience for *Hannibal* knows that eventually, its protagonist Hannibal Lecter will be caught out as the cannibal serial killer that he is and imprisoned. The series’ second season plays on this traditional knowledge and opens with a brutal fight scene between Hannibal Lecter and FBI Agent Jack Crawford: then a title card sets the next scene at ‘twelve weeks earlier’ and shows Hannibal and Jack sitting down for a nice dinner. Any audience

member, then, watches the next twelve hours or so of the story trying to figure out how Jack and Hannibal end up where they do; the traditional audience will be waiting to see if this scene leads to Hannibal's arrest. Everyone wants to know how Hannibal will finally be caught out. Complaining about the use of this television narrative strategy (termed here an '*in media res* opening'), critic Todd VanDerWerff pointed to *Hannibal* as a clear exception:

There are very rare occasions (like on the second-season premiere of *Hannibal*) where the audience will say "Ooooh! I can't wait to get to that!"... It works because it teases a point of no return, a moment that the story cannot turn back from.³

So similarly the audience of the *Iliad* now lies in wait, waiting to see how and when Sarpedon and Patroklos and Hektor and (maybe even) Achilles will die.

Achilles/Patroklos: 16.1–100

Book 16 marks the start of a new beat sequence, and possibly a full 'episode', that contains the epic's first major deaths: Sarpedon and Patroklos. The beginning of the book recaps more events from previous episodes than usual, marking it out as an 'episode' of particular significance, and one that could work in a stand-alone performance.⁴ In the first beat, Achilles and Patroklos have an exchange where Achilles finally agrees to Patroklos joining the battle. Their exchange begins with Achilles comparing the approaching Patroklos to a little girl crying after her mother:⁵ with this simile, Achilles re-establishes the intimacy between the two men, whom we have not actually seen together in almost three and a half hours of performance time, without breaks (since 11.604–16). Achilles then asks Patroklos what is wrong, asking after the Achaians. In answering Achilles' question as to why he is so grieved, Patroklos recaps the list of the Achaian wounded (16.25–7), when he tells Achilles about the wounded Diomedes (11.399f), Odysseus (11.487f.), Agamemnon (11.282f.), and Eurypylos (11.805–12). The fact that Patroklos ignores these men's more recent rally (14.103–34) might speak to the fact that he did not witness it, creating more character continuity as he was in Eurypylos's tent during that sequence. More, Patroklos's assertion that all these Achaians are still injured makes his speech more pathetic and the need more urgent. Patroklos ends his speech by repeating Nestor's mission to either get Achilles to return, or, if Achilles hangs back for some reason, to go himself into battle (16.36–43 = 11.793–800). Repeating

Nestor's idea that Achilles might hang back because of something Thetis told him creates an opportunity for more audience access to Achilles, as he will respond directly to this, and give his own reasons. But before the narrative even gets to Achilles' response, it comments that Patroklos, in asking to be sent into battle, is asking for his own death (16.46f.). This comment builds further audience tension around Patroklos's already-laid-out death (15.65–7), but can also establish that anticipation for any audience members who have just joined the story.⁶

Achilles denies hanging back out of something Thetis has said, recapping instead his conflict with Agamemnon (16.56–9). In these few minutes of performance time, the narrator has nearly completely brought any audience member up to speed with respect to the Achaians, especially the major characters. Achilles then adds to the foreshadowing of his own return (cf. 2.694; 8.474–6; 15.64–8), in recapping his past assertion that his anger towards Agamemnon would end when the fire reaches his ships; that assertion took place over five hours ago in performance time, without breaks (16.61, cf. 9.649–55). Then Achilles turns to the present, 'but now' (νῦν δὲ, 16.73), where Diomedes and Agamemnon no longer fight by the ships, but Achilles hears Hektor calling to the Trojans all around him (16.74–9). This recaps Hektor's role as the Trojan leader, as the Trojans fight now around the Achaian ships (cf. 15.742–6). Finally, Achilles looks towards the future, warning Patroklos off of trying to take Troy on his own, 'lest one of the everlasting gods stamps you down from Olympos' (μή τις ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο θεῶν αἰγιγενετῶν/ ἐμβήη, 16.93f.) and specifically mentioning Apollo as a Trojan ally (16.94f.; cf. 15.221–36), which builds audience anticipation for the possibility of Apollo's role in Patroklos's coming death. Achilles ends on his odd prayer that everyone else, both Trojans and Argives, be destroyed, so that he and Patroklos alone might take the city (16.97–100): the intimacy of this image, of the two men alone in a ruined world, leaves us with a lingering sense of the intense emotions that Achilles has for his companion.

Hektor: 16.101–23

After these recaps, character re-introductions, and glances forward, the narrative cuts back to the battle itself, which we left at the end of Book 15, with Aias defending the ships against Hektor. The audience aligns with Aias, who still holds the line at the ships, but just barely; a detailed description of his physical

state builds audience allegiance with him, as he struggles but will not yield (16.102–11). The narrator takes a moment to ask the Muses' help in relaying how the Trojans finally break through and set fire to the ships (16.112f.): Hektor hacks at Aias's spear with his sword, cutting off its head (16.114–18). As the narrative gives the audience access to Aias through his fear response, his recognition of Zeus's support for Hektor recaps that support (16.118–21; cf. 15.694f.). This recognition forces Aias to retreat, and the ships catch fire (16.122f.).

Achilles/Patroklos: 16.124–256

The narrative then switches scenes back to Achilles, following his gaze as he *sees* the ships catch fire and urges Patroklos into battle as he himself goes to gather the men (16.124–9).⁷ The previous beat and this perception of those events detail the real present danger to the ships that gives urgency to Patroklos's entry into the battle. Aias's giving way against Hektor in the previous beat (16.122) also makes room for Patroklos to come in as the new primary Achaian antagonist to the Trojan Hektor.

Patroklos's arming sequence follows (16.130–9), and as in other arming scenes, the narrative extensively aligns the audience with Patroklos before he goes to battle.⁸ Then the narrative disrupts the typical arming scene through its comment that Patroklos cannot take Achilles' spear (16.140–4), emphasizing his being weaker than Achilles (recapping 11.786).⁹ Finally, Automedon as his charioteer readies the very immortal horses of Achilles himself (16.144–54): all of these elements build audience anticipation to guess what role they will play in the coming battle.

The next beat aligns the audience with Achilles again as he gets the ranks of the Myrmidons in order, and the narrative presents yet another mini-catalogue before battle, introducing Menesthios, Eudoros, Peisandros, Phoinix, and Alkimedon (16.173–97). As Achilles exhorts the leaders before they head into battle, he fills in a gap in audience knowledge, mentioning that his men were unhappy with him for staying out of the fight (16.200–9), creating the illusion of continuity in Achilles' story arc and deepening his character, even when he has spent so much time absent from the narrative.

As Patroklos and Automedon take their place at the front of the Myrmidon force, the audience remains attached to Achilles as he returns to his tent to pray to Zeus (16.233–48). With Achilles' prayer, the narrative provides the audience

access into what he wants, which deepens his character, reflects on other characters and creates audience anticipation for possible future events. Achilles hopes that Hektor finds out what kind of a fighter Patroklos is (ἄφρα καὶ Ἐκτωρ/ εἴσεται ἢ ῥά καὶ οἷος ἐπίσπηται πολέμειζεν/ ἡμέτερος θεράπων, 16.242–4). This reasserts Hektor's central role while it also emphasizes the close ties between Achilles and 'his helper',¹⁰ especially as Achilles refers to Patroklos's past successes as being accompanied by his own (16.244f.). This also raises questions about how well Patroklos will be able to do in the coming battle on his own. Achilles anticipates the confrontation between Hektor and Patroklos that Zeus has laid out (15.64–7), so that his anticipation mirrors the audience's, while his investment in the outcome of their fight shapes the audience's moving forward. Achilles' prayer continues, hoping that Patroklos will beat the Trojans back and then safely return in all his armour (16.246–9). When Achilles has finished praying, the narrator tells us that Zeus will let Patroklos drive the Trojans back from the ships, but will not allow his safe return (16.250–2). This is the second time in the last fifteen minutes that the narrative has explicitly told the audience that Patroklos is going to die (16.46f.). This narrative comment, coming right on the heels of Achilles' concern for his friend, tightens up the audience's emotional engagement, caught now again in the extra knowledge that Patroklos must die.

Battle: 16.257–357

The fighting begins in the next scene, with the Myrmidons charging in like angry wasps protecting their homes (16.257–65; cf. 12.167–72): the imagery recalls Nestor's own pleas with the Achaians to think of their families in defending the ships in the previous episode (15.661–6).¹¹ This again paints the Achaians as defenders with something to defend,¹² and might affect the audience's allegiance with them as the fight begins. Patroklos exhorts the men to bring Achilles honour and make Agamemnon realize his madness through fighting well (16.269–74), recapping yet again, from another point of view, the quarrel from the epic's first 'episode' while providing motivation for the men to fight.

The narrative switches audience alignment to the Trojans, who see Patroklos and the Myrmidons enter battle, and, with Patroklos in Achilles' armour, think that Achilles has given up his anger and returned to battle (16.278–83). But the narrative quickly re-establishes audience recognition for Patroklos, aligning the audience with him and naming him, as he casts the first spear in this new battle sequence (16.284f.). He strikes Pyraichmenes, significantly next to Protesilaos's

ship (16.286–91), which the attentive listener will remember is the ship that Hektor grabbed at the end of the last ‘episode’ (15.704f.), giving a sense of continuous place on the battlefield and creating further anticipation for Patroklos’s coming confrontation with Hektor. With this kill, Patroklos effectively puts out the fire, and encourages the Danaans to strike back against the Trojans from the ships (16.293–302).

The narrative switches audience alignment again to the Trojans, who do not flee, but who do give way from the ships (16.305). After zooming out for a moment (16.306), the narrative dives into another dense battle sequence that sees fourteen men die in forty-four lines, building into some of the most gruesome deaths yet,¹³ back-to-back-to-back, as the audience continuously switches alignments between sides and characters. First the narrator zooms in on Patroklos, who kills Areilykos (16.307–11), and Menelaos kills Thoas (16.311f.). Both these slayed men’s names have only been associated with the Achaian side in the past: Thoas as an Aitolian leader (2.638, 4.527, 15.281, etc.), Areilykos as the father of Prothoënor, killed by Poulydamas (14.449–52).¹⁴ These inconsistencies momentarily throw the audience off guard, forcing them to ask if they remember anything about these men (and not giving any personal details besides their deaths).¹⁵ But then the narrative almost immediately recovers its sense of continuity, because ‘next’ to Menelaos in the narrative is Meges, who kills Amphiklos (16.311–16). The last time the narrator left Menelaos, around forty minutes ago, he was with Meges, the two of them working together to kill Dolops and strip his corpse (15.539–44). Again, the narrative creates the illusion of continuity from the last ‘episode’ to this, with these two men still fighting near one another.¹⁶ Next, Antilochos kills Atymnios (16.317–19), whose brother Maris tries to kill Antilochos (16.319–21), but is killed by Thrasymedes, who tears the man’s arm clean off with his spear (16.321–5). The narrative takes a moment with these two dead brothers, who were introduced only to die: they were Sarpedon’s friends (16.326–9), and their death obliquely reintroduces his character here, with these men serving as early red-shirts that raise the stakes for death near him.¹⁷ Then Oilean Aias kills Kleoboulos, another man introduced just to die: Aias grabs him and hacks at his neck so that his sword ‘smokes with blood’ (πᾶν δ’ ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι, 16.333), a vivid image that the next beat bests. Peneleos and Lykon charge each other with their swords, having missed each other with their spears, and Peneleos slices Lykon across the neck under the ear, so that only a flap of skin still holds his slumped head on (16.339–41).¹⁸ Finally, Meriones kills Akamas as he tries to get on his chariot, while Idomeneus stabs Erymas through the mouth (16.342–50). As with Meges and

Menelaos, the last time we saw Meriones and Idomeneus, a pair already bound to one another through their relationship and their Cretan roles (cf. 2.650f.), they were fighting together (15.301f.). So the narrative again gives the audience a sense of continuity, as it continues their intertwined arcs, and reinforces their relationship here. Idomeneus's blow shatters Erymas's bones, shakes the teeth out of his head, fills his eyes up with blood, and finally, the man dies, spewing blood from his nose (16.345–50). This level of brutality is not new, but the density of it is. In any serial narrative, repetition of type scenes also usually means escalation,¹⁹ particularly as it moves towards major events. Think of *Daredevil* (Netflix, 2015–): in the first season, there is a famous three-minute continuous fight sequence that follows Daredevil against six or seven attackers down a hallway;²⁰ in the second season, another continuous fight sequence, this one five minutes, follows Daredevil down a hallway, several flights of stairs, and another hallway, as he takes on a biker gang of around fifteen guys.²¹ Repetition is not enough in the aesthetics of violence. The narrative zooms back out, aligning the audience with the Danaans as they fall upon the Trojans like wolves upon lambs (16.351–7; cf. 16.156–63).

Aias/Hektor: 16.358–418

Now the narrative cuts back to Aias, whom the narrative last showed giving way, letting the ships catch fire as he recognized Zeus's role in Hektor's success against him (16.114–23; γνῶ at 6.119). But when the audience aligns with Aias again, he is 'always' trying to hit Hektor (αἰὲν, 16.355), slightly effacing Aias's giving way, to suggest that their fighting has been continuous. The fight between Aias and Hektor has been going on for around fifty minutes of performance time (since 15.414), even longer if we consider a break between Books 15 and 16. The narrative switches audience alignment back to Hektor, who now is on the defensive, using his shield to avoid Aias's many casts, because he knows how to fight (16.359–61); this recaps and confirms Hektor's own claim of knowing how to fight, back in his single combat with Aias, over seven hours ago (7.234–43).²² And now, *Hektor* recognizes that the tide has turned against him (γίνωσκε, 16.362), but he defends his men anyway (16.363 cf. Aias at 16.119–21). This audience alignment with Hektor, the access to his knowing that he is losing and keeping on anyway, creates further audience allegiance with the Trojan hero.

But then the narrative immediately calls whatever allegiance has been built into question, because after a simile describing the rising of the Trojans' terrified

shouts like a thunderhead, the Trojans run, and Hektor runs, too, and ‘leaves his men behind’ (λείπε δὲ λαὸν/ Τρωϊκόν, 16.368f.).²³ The narrative makes little effort to explain this sudden shift, which has profound implications for audience allegiance to Hektor’s character as he abandons his men to die, quite graphically, in the ditch (16.367–79). In terms of narrative, Hektor’s removal here from the battlefield allows for Patroklos’s ascendancy and for other Trojans to come to the foreground against him, including Sarpedon. But for me, it still leaves a sinking feeling, a gnawing that Hektor should not have run away, especially not with Aias holding out so well in contrast. Hektor’s flight disrupts the anticipated confrontation between Hektor and Patroklos that so many previous beats suggested, giving just a brief, teasing, glimpse of that fight, as Patroklos tries to hit Hektor, and Hektor escapes (16.380–3).

The narrative then switches audience alignment to Patroklos as he breaks through the front lines (πρώτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας, 16.394) and then kills no fewer than twelve men in just under two minutes of performance time (16.399–418). Through these scenes, the narrative presents a seemingly unstoppable Patroklos – but is it enough to make an audience forgive Hektor for running away? In a review of the *Game of Thrones* episode ‘Hardhome’,²⁴ *Verge* critic Emily Yoshida, writing about a White Walker (zombie) massacre that one of the show’s protagonists Jon Snow escapes from, says: “My heart says Jon should get a bonus score just for not dying, because it seemed all but inevitable for a second there . . .”²⁵ While Jon Snow escapes, a new heroine, Karsi, just introduced in the same episode, falls at the hands of the wights, after two extended scenes and a glimpse of her children – enough to create a context for emotional investment in her character. But just the same, she is a red-shirt, a proxy kill for whom the audience can lament, but then think, with relief, that at least their hero is still safe. The *Iliad* goes much further in its ‘proxy’ kill for this ‘episode’, fulfilling what has already been predicted as it pushes Sarpedon out against Patroklos in Hektor’s absence (cf. 15.65–8). Significantly, the relief felt for Jon Snow comes *after* we see the death of Karsi, the wilding woman. We cannot feel relief that Hektor has survived when he runs away *before* Sarpedon confronts the raging Patroklos. All the audience *can* feel is even more fear for Sarpedon.

Sarpedon: 16.419–507

Sarpedon has barely seen action since his help in breaking up the Achaian battlements back at 12.397 – over three hours of performance time have passed

since then, and there have probably been a few breaks in the performance since then as well. Just the same, Sarpedon is brought back slowly into the mind of the audience before his death-scene, through both Zeus and Glaukos – those closest to him – to maximize the emotional affect of his death. First, Zeus forecasts Sarpedon's death (15.65–8). Then, in the scenes just prior to Sarpedon stepping out against Patroklos, Sarpedon has his own red-shirt proxies, when his friends Maris and Atymnios died at the hands of the Danaans (16.317–29). Now Sarpedon tells his Lykians that he will be the one to confront the raging Patroklos (16.422–5),²⁶ and an audience might brace themselves for what they know *will* happen. The two men are both like vultures as they rush each other (16.428–30). Suddenly the narrative aligns the audience with Zeus, watching from above, who debates with Hera whether or not he should let Sarpedon die (16.460f.). Hera says that he should, but suggests that Sarpedon's body might be carried off to Lykia by Sleep and Death (16.450–7); a possibility now established in the mind of the audience, just as surely as Sarpedon's death has now been confirmed. So Zeus agrees, and weeps bloody tears (16.459–61). Zeus's tears here cue audience allegiance: Sarpedon's death has not even happened yet, and it already has emotional consequences (cf. Hektor, 6.497–502).²⁷ Zeus's care for Sarpedon also calls back to that he has for Hektor, whom he *did* save (cf. 11.163f.), and whom Sarpedon replaces as the primary Trojan-allied fighter now. The next beat continues to build audience anticipation, offering up another red-shirt to Patroklos's spear: Thrasymelos, a helper of Sarpedon's (ἡϋς θεράπων Σαρπηδόνοϋ, 16.464). Finally, the audience aligns with Patroklos as he strikes Sarpedon himself, sends him down like an oak tree,²⁸ like a bull killed by a lion (16.479–91). And then the audience switches their alignment to Sarpedon as he dies and he calls out to his companion Glaukos (16.492–501). And again, we switch to Glaukos, getting access to his terrible grief at Sarpedon's words, to his emotional response to Sarpedon's death, now after the death (16.508). The entire death sequence takes less than three minutes, but it is the longest death so far in the epic, and certainly the one that the narrative has created the most audience investment in.

Mission/Hektor: 16.508–53

Sarpedon's dying words command Glaukos to rescue his corpse from the battlefield (16.492–501). This mission sets Glaukos into action, creating audience anticipation as they align with Glaukos, wondering how and if he

will be able to carry out Sarpedon's dying wish. Glaukos holds his wounded arm, that the narrative recalls was struck by Teukros's arrow when he was on the wall (16.510–12 recaps 12.387–9) and prays to Apollo to heal it, recapping Sarpedon's death and his mission to rescue the corpse (16.521–6). Apollo listens to his prayer (16.514–31). The audience remains attached to Glaukos as he first rallies the Lykian lords, before also gathering Poulydamas, Aineias, and Hektor to fight for the fallen Sarpedon (16.532–7).²⁹ Glaukos names only Hektor (16.538) in his shaming exhortation that recaps Patroklos's killing Sarpedon (16.541–3 recaps 16.479–505), and rouses the Trojans. This might jar audience allegiance, if they remember that the narrator did last show Hektor running away, leaving his men behind (16.367–9).³⁰ The order of the previous beats points towards Sarpedon's death being, at least in part, Hektor's fault: Hektor runs away, Patroklos kills many Trojans and Lykians, Sarpedon challenges Patroklos, Sarpedon dies, Glaukos rebukes Hektor. This creates a complicated emotional dynamic: on the one hand, Sarpedon's death significantly raises the stakes for Hektor himself, for the first time showing us that death is possible for the *Iliad's* primary characters. He is the Jory, or the Syrio Forel, to *Game of Thrones'* Ned Stark.³¹ On the other hand, the audience, along with Glaukos, can blame Hektor for Sarpedon's death. These two things are not mutually exclusive, of course: Hektor's flight reveals his vulnerability, his human-ness that puts Sarpedon's death in context as much as it stands in contrast to it.

Glaukos's speech also plays a part in the epic's melodramatic alignment structure, as it informs the rest of the troops of Sarpedon's death, which the audience has, of course, already experienced. This allows audience access to the Trojans' extended emotional response to the news:

Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρήθην λάβει πένθος
 ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν, ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἔρμα πόληος
 ἔσκε καὶ ἄλλοδαπός περ ἐών· πολέες γὰρ ἄμ' αὐτῷ
 λαοὶ ἔποντ', ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι.

An unstoppable sorrow that wouldn't let up
 took hold of the Trojans from head to toe, since he was their city's stay,
 even though he was a foreigner. Because many people
 came with him, but he was the best at fighting.

16.548–51

The narrative uses Sarpedon's role to explain the intensity of the Trojans' grief, which now serves as their motivation – the next line shows them charging

the Danaans, with Hektor leading them, in their rage over Sarpedon (16.552f.). Now they all rally to save his body, acting indirectly on his last words (16.492–501).

Patroklos/Counter-mission: 16.554–683

The narrative switches the audience's alignment to the Achaians as the Trojans now charge, and Patroklos urges the Aiantes to strip Sarpedon, 'who was the first to leap over the Achaian wall' (ὁς πρῶτος ἐσήλατο τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν, 16.558). Here Patroklos recaps an event that he could not have seen (he was in Eurypylos's tent at the time) and that is not exactly true (Sarpedon pulls down part of the battlement, but does not break down the gates, 12.397–9). This 'memory' would trigger the audience's own, so that they might delight in remembering one of Sarpedon's finest moments. Or they might just as likely remember that it was Hektor, his eyes flashing, who broke through the Achaian gates (12.462–6). The ambiguity increases the audience's engagement in reassessing their own allegiance to Sarpedon. With Patroklos's exhortation, now the Achaians, too, fight over Sarpedon. The narrative shows the two sides coming together, Trojans and Lykians against Myrmidons and Achaians (16.564), clashing over Sarpedon's body, as Zeus casts darkness and death over them all (16.567f.).

In the next beat, the fight begins. Epigeus, one of Achilles' men, dies first, killed by Hektor with a rock to the head (16.577). The narrative switches audience alignment back to Patroklos, who, grieving for Epigeus, makes his way through the armies like a hawk through a flock of starlings (16.582f.). The narrator calls out to Patroklos as he runs, and repeats his anger over his companion Epigeus (16.584f.): this apostrophe intensifies the audience's alignment with him while building audience allegiance through the emotional justification of his charge. He drives the Trojans and Hektor backwards (16.588); but Glaukos turns back to fight once more (16.593f.). So the narrative again juxtaposes Hektor's flight and his ally's courage, inviting its audience to judge both men as they will. The narrator keeps the audience's alignment shifting in order to show that Glaukos's valiant killing of Bathykles (16.593–8) has both emotional and real consequences: it disheartens the Achaians, though not enough to make them flee, while it encourages the Trojans enough to get them back into the fight (16.599–602).

Next the narrative aligns the audience with Meriones as he kills Laogonos (16.603–7), then with Aineias as he throws his spear at Meriones, but misses

(16.608–15). They exchange words, before Patroklos muses on how useless words are on the battlefield and charges like a god into the fray (16.616–32). This leads the narrative into two beautiful similes that describe the intensity of the tumult (like trees being felled, 16.634) and the density of the men around the corpse (like flies on milk, 16.642),³² before the narrative switches audience alignment again to Zeus.

The narrative then gives the audience access to Zeus as he considers whether now is the time that he should let Hektor kill Patroklos (16.644–51). This recaps and plays on Zeus's earlier refusal to save Patroklos (16.251f.), and his prediction of Hektor killing Patroklos in the last (15.63–7). Not yet. Instead, he plans to let Patroklos drive Hektor and the Trojans back towards the city (16.653–5), setting the plot for the next beats. So Zeus puts a courage-less spirit (ἀνάγκιδα θυμὸν, 16.656) in Hektor, and, for the third time in the last twenty minutes of performance, Hektor runs away (16.657f.; cf. 16.367–6, 16.588).

Hektor's flight is another divine trick, a narrative ruse, a conspiracy of both, to build in more story, more character information, before the inevitable death of Patroklos that this last hour of performance has been building to. Here Hektor's behaviour stands in contrast with that of Glaukos and of Sarpedon himself. This last instance of flight stems explicitly from Zeus's will, so the audience might not fault him for it. But just the same, the next beat shows the Achaians stripping Sarpedon's body, showing that Hektor cannot protect what he should: he has failed in his mission (16.663–5; cf. 16.538–47).

This final segment of Sarpedon's story arc (16.419–683), which starts when he confronts Patroklos and goes through the struggle over his corpse, comes to an end when Zeus orders Apollo to get Sleep and Death to return his body to Lykia (16.666–83). Zeus's orders recap Hera's suggestion from 16.450–61, bringing their exchange back to mind, making Sarpedon's death, which Zeus might have prevented, which Zeus himself mourned (16.458–61), all the more poignant. The whole arc takes about twenty minutes of performance and the narrative engages its melodramatic alignment structure in order to place Sarpedon, and his corpse, at an intersection of multiple character, narrator, and audience perspectives and emotional responses. Sarpedon, as the first major character to die in the epic, provides a narrative template that expands on the condensed deaths of red-shirts that incorporate backstory and emotional responses, which will in turn be expanded upon for the still-coming deaths of Patroklos and Hektor.

Patroklos/Hektor: 16.684–867

The narrative switches audience alignment away from Sarpedon's body in Lykia back to Patroklos on the battlefield. Now the narrator is ominous in describing Patroklos: he is 'really reckless' (μέγ' ἄασθη, 16.685); now he is a fool (νήπιος, 16.686). If only he had kept Achilles' command in mind, the narrator says (recapping 16.87–96), then he might not have died (16.686f.).³³ The narrative judges him, but does so in a way that invites *pathos*, especially as it then says that the Zeus's will is stronger than that of any man (16.688–90). One more time, the narrator addresses Patroklos, asking him directly how many men he killed, as the gods call him to his death (16.692f.)?³⁴ So the narrator again forges this intense alignment with Patroklos through its apostrophe, but now plays with the terrible tension between his knowledge, Patroklos's knowledge, and the audience's own: it is painful to watch *because* we know what is going to happen next.³⁵

Patroklos kills nine more men in just three lines (16.694–6), and then, in a contrafactual, the narrator claims that the Achaians and Patroklos would have taken all of Troy, if Apollo had not stepped in (16.698–701). This contrafactual adds more depth to the narrative's intense foreshadowing of Patroklos's death in the previous beat, suggesting how truly great Patroklos is, here, right before the moment of his death. The alternative world that the contrafactual shows a glimpse of piques audience engagement, as they might wonder if there was really another way that the story could have unfolded, and that ambiguity might alter their allegiance with Patroklos.³⁶ Patroklos charges three times, but Apollo forces Patroklos to give way and he reminds Patroklos that it is not for him to take Troy (16.702–11; cf. 16.87–96). In other words, he sets the story straight again, on the course that it was always meant to run.

The scene switches scenes again to Hektor, inside the Skaian gates (16.712). Again the narrative creates the illusion of character continuity: if it last showed Hektor running away (16.656–8), while it has been aligned with Patroklos, Hektor has reached his destination, the safety of Troy itself. Hektor ponders whether or not he should go back out to the fight or rally his people inside the wall (16.713f.); this is an ironic callback to Andromache's hope that Hektor would defend the city from within the walls (6.431–9). Now the audience aligns with Apollo, disguised as Asios, Hektor's uncle, as he exhorts Hektor, telling him that Apollo might let him kill Patroklos (16.721–5). So the narrator again exploits the melodramatic alignment structure, because while 'Asios' proposes this as merely a possibility to Hektor (αἴ κέν πῶς μιν ἔλησ, 16.725), the audience knows that it is a certainty (cf. 15.65). So Hektor heads back into battle,

accompanied by Kebriones (16.726–8), another moment of character continuity as Kebriones takes on this role as Hektor's charioteer again after several hours (11.521–42).

The narrative keeps the audience attached to them as they head straight for Patroklos (16.731f.). As Hektor and Patroklos face off, Patroklos quickly dispatches Kebriones (16.737) – he dies about one minute after being introduced into the scene, so easily qualifies as a red-shirt for Hektor, though he has long been part of the narrative.³⁷ More, as he dies, the narrative reinforces his role as charioteer and his relationship to Hektor as his half-brother, Priam's illegitimate son (16.738–9), giving his death more contextual weight, and increasing the *pathos* around Hektor. With this death, the narrator shows off how he has misdirected the audience: though Apollo (and Zeus) have seemingly tipped the balance in Hektor's favour, he loses his charioteer, and Patroklos vaunts over the fallen man, calling him a diver, an acrobat (16.745–50).³⁸ And as Patroklos crouches over Kebriones' body to make his boast, the narrator again calls out to him, intensifying audience alignment with the doomed but victorious Myrmidon (16.756). Hektor and Patroklos fight over Kebriones' corpse for some time (16.759–78), while Kebriones' body lies there, 'having forgotten about chariot-driving' (16.776). This last little repetition of Kebriones' name and role, well after his death, brings home audience allegiance to his character, minor as it may be. The narrator then switches alignment from Kebriones' corpse to the Achaians, who win out, taking his body and stripping his corpse (16.780–2).

But finally, finally, the audience aligns with Patroklos, who three times charging once again, finds his fate, blissfully unaware of Apollo stalking him through the throng (16.784–92). The narrator switches audience alignment to Apollo as he stalks, and then, standing right behind him, knocks Patroklos's armour to the ground – his helmet falls to Hektor, who puts it on, his own death close to him (τότε δὲ Ζεὺς Ἐκτορι δῶκεν/ ἧ κεφαλῆ φορέειν, σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦεν ὄλεθρος, 16.799f.). As Apollo takes Patroklos's senses, the narrative recalls that Apollo is Zeus's son, recalls that this is all part of Zeus's plan (16.804f. recaps 15.58–68). Then, Euphorbos, in his first appearance, stabs Patroklos and runs away (16.808–15); this surprises audience expectations entirely. Euphorbos has never been mentioned as Patroklos's killer, and his role here takes away from Hektor's own, which has already been established in the narrative. But even in this hit-and-run, the narrative gives the audience an illusion of Euphorbos's character depth: did you know that he has already killed twenty men (16.810f.)? That he is a great horseman (16.811)? The audience might not have heard of him, but the narrative assures them that he has been doing great things. Finally, the

alignment switches back to Hektor as he sees the dazed Patroklos trying to flee and he thrusts his spear through Patroklos's guts in a fatal blow (16.818–21). Patroklos falls and 'the Achaian people grieve greatly' (μέγα δ' ἤκαχε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν, 16.822). Patroklos, the brave son of Menoitios, who had killed many (ὡς πολέας πεφνόντα Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱόν, 16.827). As with other deaths, the narrative provides an internal audience's emotional response and a recapitulation/justification for that emotional response, giving its audience more fodder for character allegiance.

Then the narrative aligns the audience with Hektor as he vaunts over Patroklos and subjectively reshapes the events that have just unfolded, which elaborates his own character. First, Hektor imagines that Patroklos wanted to sack the city and take the Trojan women's day of liberty (16.830–2). Patroklos *had* wanted to take the city, but gave way to Apollo's warning that he could not (16.702–11); he never specifically mentioned the Trojan women, and Hektor bringing up the women here probably reflects more on Hektor's concerns than on any specific desire of Patroklos's. After all, Hektor has already imagined Andromache losing her freedom (6.455), and told Diomedes that he would not 'lead away the women in the ships' (8.165f.). Hektor then boasts that he has saved the Trojans through killing Patroklos, whom the vultures will eat (16.833–6). Hektor also imagines what Achilles might have said to Patroklos before sending him into battle, and this too, strongly shapes how we understand Hektor:

ἄ δειλ', οὐδέ τοι ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν χραίσμησεν Ἀχιλλεύς,
 ὅς πού τοι μάλα πολλὰ μένων ἐπετέλλετ' ἰόντι·
 μὴ μοι πρὶν ἰέναι Πατρόκλεες ἵπποκέλευθε
 νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς πρὶν Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
 αἱματόεντα χιτῶνα περιστήθεσσι δαΐξαι.
 ὧς πού σε προσέφη, σοὶ δὲ φρένας ἄφροني πείθε.

'Poor you, not even Achilles, as great as he is, is of any use,
 he who stayed behind while he must've commanded many things to you:
 "Patroklos, horse-lord, don't come back to me
 by the hollow ships until you've ripped the bloody
 tunic from man-slaughtering Hektor."

So he must've ordered you, and convinced your thoughtless thoughts.'

Hektor to Patroklos, 16.837–42

Hektor shows that Achilles' absence is the reason that Patroklos now dies.³⁹ At the same time, Hektor imagines that what Achilles wanted was for Patroklos to have killed him. This recaps Achilles' hope that the two would fight, faulting Achilles, in a way, for thinking that Patroklos might have been able to win

without him (16.242–5). Hektor imagines that Achilles wanted him dead, so he vaunts here because he has survived. In the end, Hektor reshapes his narrative so that the audience judge how they feel that he has escaped death, and killed Patroklos, because Hektor himself is relieved. For Hektor, he sees that he has survived another day, and that means something not just for him, but for all of Troy, and for the Trojan women.

As Hektor's speech foregrounds his place as a survivor, Patroklos's response undercuts that place. Patroklos's dying words recap the influence of Zeus (16.844f.) and the actions of Apollo (16.844–9 recaps 16.788–805) and Euphorbos (16.850 recaps 16.808–15) that led to his death. Then Patroklos predicts Hektor's own death, soon to come, at the hands of Achilles (16.851–3 recapping 15.59–71). Hektor shrugs this off, says maybe he will be the one to kill Achilles in the end (16.860f.). But by now, everyone knows that that is not the way this story goes. The book ends with Hektor chasing after Automedon, who escapes on Achilles' immortal horses (16.864–7 recalls 16.145–54). This end of Book 16 likely signals a performance break, as Patroklos's death marks the resolution of his living story arc, while his dying words leave Hektor's arc dangling for the next episodes.⁴⁰

Bad news travels slow (Menelaos): 17.1–112

While Book 16 ends with Patroklos's death, the narrative exploits its melodramatic alignment structure by purposefully building in diverse responses to his death, which will continue to escalate in emotional significance and plot consequence through the coming scenes.⁴¹ *Game of Thrones* uses a similar technique in dealing with the death of its first primary character, Ned Stark, in its first season. The season's penultimate episode ends with Ned Stark's beheading. The season finale picks up at exactly that point, but over the next several beats shows the responses of those close to Ned, namely his children, his wife and his men. These responses reflect backwards onto Ned's character himself, while deepening the characters of those responding to his death. Certain characters' emotional responses to his death also have real consequences for the plot, such as when Ned Stark's men, upon hearing of his death, decide that they no longer want to support the king, and declare Ned Stark's son Robb king instead. The *Iliad* treats Patroklos's death in a very similar way, using its melodramatic alignment structure to build to further major plot points while other characters deepen, looking backwards to his death and forwards to its consequences.

This 'episode' opens with Patroklos's death, before switching audience alignment to Menelaos, who sees and runs over to protect the body, which, like the wall before, becomes the focal point of alignment for the next battle sequences.⁴² As Menelaos sees Patroklos's death, the narrative moves us back in time to that moment so that we can see Menelaos's response.⁴³ The narrative emphasizes the relationship between Menelaos and the fallen Patroklos with the first of many protective parental similes in the episode, with Menelaos like a mother cow over its first-born calf (17.1–5). Then the narrative switches the audience's alignment to the other side, where Euphorbos, too, sees Patroklos's death and confronts Menelaos over the body (17.9–11): in just this first minute the narrative already gives us two opposing responses to Patroklos's death. As Euphorbos confronts Menelaos, he recaps his own role in Patroklos's death in the previous episode (17.12–17 recaps 16.808–15).

In Menelaos's response, he also recaps an earlier kill, boasting to Euphorbos about killing his brother Hyperenor (17.24–8 recaps 14.516–19). The narrative made no note of this relation at Hyperenor's death, so the way that Menelaos brings up Hyperenor here (after nearly two hours of performance time) is as much a surprise to the audience as it is to Euphorbos himself, though the audience 'experienced' that death. After this boast, Menelaos says that rather than die like his brother, Euphorbos should run away (17.30–2). Menelaos seemingly giving Euphorbos a chance to live here calls back to when he captured Adrestos alive (6.37–51). Euphorbos's reply speaks to Hyperenor's grieving widow and family, and suggests that Menelaos's death – specifically his head and his armour – might assuage their terrible sorrow (17.33–40; cf. Hektor's wish for Astyanax at 6.480f.). But Menelaos kills Euphorbos (in one of the loveliest death scenes in the whole epic) and strips his armour (17.45–60).

The narrator switches audience alignment back to the Trojans, who are all too afraid to face Menelaos (17.61–9). A contrafactual allows the narrative to change the audience's alignment again, as Menelaos would have finished stripping Euphorbos's armour, if Apollo had not intervened. Now the audience attaches to Apollo (disguised as Mentos) as he approaches Hektor and scolds him for running after Achilles' horses when Menelaos has killed Euphorbos (17.75–81). Apollo's rebuke recaps Hektor's actions from the very end of the last episode (16.862–7), creating the illusion that Hektor carried on this way while the beat between Menelaos and Euphorbos took place. At the same time, the juxtaposition between the beats in sequence implicitly compares Hektor running after the horses to Menelaos defending his friend's body and stripping his enemy's, making space for audience allegiance to emerge.

The narrative gives the audience access to Hektor as he grieves over Euphorbos and looks across the battlefield (17.83f.): the narrative uses his perception to once again draw the contrast between Menelaos's activities and Hektor's own as Hektor sees Menelaos stripping Euphorbos's body, still gushing blood from its spear wound (17.84f.). Hektor snaps into action, ranging through the frontlines shouting, looking like Hephaistos's flame (17.87–91). The narrator switches audience alignment back to Menelaos as he hears Hektor's cry (17.89) and he debates what to do. Menelaos's speech mentions Hektor three times (17.94, 17.96, 17.101), building anticipation for their confrontation. In his last reference to Hektor, Menelaos claims that Hektor's 'fighting comes from god' (ἐπεὶ ἐκ θεόφιν πολεμιζει, 17.101), which recaps Zeus's (and Apollo's) support of Hektor while also leading Menelaos to decide to fetch Aias to help him. This sets the mission for the next beat and creates audience anticipation for another confrontation between Aias and Hektor.

Aias/Hektor: 17.113–39

The narrative keeps the audience attached to Menelaos as he finds Aias and tells him to come help him with Patroklos's body and that they should take the body to Achilles, even though Hektor has taken Patroklos's armour (17.120–2). This mention of Achilles obliquely builds audience anticipation for what *his* response will be to Patroklos's death. But Hektor has not stripped the armour: the narrative uses Menelaos's speech to imply that Hektor is stripping it *while* Menelaos speaks,⁴⁴ and the illusion becomes complete when the narrative switches alignment back to Hektor when he has finished stripping Patroklos's armour (17.125).

Hektor does not stop at stripping the corpse – he wants to hack off its head and throw the body to the dogs.⁴⁵ This comes just a few minutes after the now-dead Euphorbos threatened Menelaos with the same fate (17.38–40), which provides context for what Hektor tries to do. More, we have seen Oilean Aias hack off Imbrios's head and throw it like a ball that landed in the dust at Hektor's feet (13.202–5). These examples give the audience context for this level of violence, but do not necessarily allay any misgivings about it. We can see something similar in a character like *Game of Thrones*' 'The Hound', Sandor Clegane, who, fairly early on in the series (S1E2), runs down a butcher's boy. His violence clearly fits into his world, but he still stands out as a self-proclaimed 'killer' who also saves both Stark girls' lives. These ambiguities of character do

not necessarily resolve, but they do keep us engaged. In any case, Hektor does not succeed in decapitating Patroklos's corpse. Instead, the narrative keeps the audience aligned with him as he runs away as soon as he sees Aias approaching the body, taking Patroklos's armour with him and handing it over to the Trojans to take back to the city (17.129–31).

The scene quickly switches back to Aias, with another parental simile that compares his protection of Patroklos's body to a lion protecting his cubs (17.131–5);⁴⁶ he guards the body along with great-grieving Menelaos (17.139), reinforcing these 'structures of care' around the fallen Patroklos.⁴⁷

Glaukos/Hektor: 17.140–82

The narrative cuts away from Menelaos and Aias to Glaukos and Hektor, and constructs a sharp contrast between the two pairs of men,⁴⁸ with Aias and Menelaos carefully guarding the corpse of their fallen companion in one beat and Glaukos rebuking Hektor for running away from Aias and abandoning Euphorbos's body in the next (17.142–58 recaps Hektor's flight at 17.129–31). In reintroducing Glaukos, the narrative picks up a dangling strand from an earlier beat sequence; Glaukos's mission to retrieve Sarpedon's corpse, which Sarpedon himself commanded at 16.492–500. Though the audience knows that Sleep and Death carried Sarpedon's corpse off to Lykia (16.676–83), Glaukos's speech reveals that he does not know this, and the audience gets further access to his character as he fashions a plan that shows his continuing efforts to retrieve his companion's corpse and to complete his mission (17.142–68). This plan involves capturing Patroklos's corpse in order to trade it for Sarpedon's body and armour (17.156–63). Glaukos's guess that Achilles would make such a trade for Patroklos creates further audience anticipation to see Achilles' response to Patroklos's death (17.164–8). At the same time, it draws a parallel between the two pairs, Achilles and Patroklos and Sarpedon and Glaukos, as those who would do anything for the other. Through Glaukos's speech, his recent actions, and the order of this episode's beats, the narrative invites the audience to see Hektor in sharp contrast to both as he seems untethered on this battlefield. Glaukos's speech ends with the damning accusation that Hektor cannot stand up to Aias because Aias is a better fighter (17.166–8); this invites the audience to recall past times where Aias and Hektor have fought, to better judge whether or not they think Glaukos is right (cf. 7.244–76; 14.402–39; 16.101–23; 16.358–63).

Hektor pushes back and claims that he does not shudder at battle and the sounds of the horses (17.175; cf. 7.235–40); this combination calls back to what Hektor has been doing (chasing after horses, cf. 16.863–7; 17.72–82) rather than fighting for Euphorbos's or Patroklos's corpse. Then Hektor blames Zeus for his running away, repeating the same three lines that the narrator used to explain Patroklos's headlong rush towards death (17.176–8 = 16.688–90): this callback suggests that this is just the rule of the world, where Zeus's will simply *is* stronger than any man's (17.176 = 16.688).⁴⁹ Finally, Hektor invites Glaukos to watch as he turns to fight, saying that he will not be a coward all day,⁵⁰ but might kill some Achaian over Patroklos's body (17.179–82). So Hektor creates audience anticipation that he will return to the battle.

Death suits you: 17.183–209

But as the audience remains attached to Hektor, he delays his return to battle, instead chasing after Patroklos's (Achilles') recently stripped armour to put it on: another of Hektor's self-imposed missions (17.188–91; cf. 6.280–5, 6.365–8). The narrative recaps that the armour he stripped from Patroklos is Achilles' armour, given to Peleus by the gods, and uses this information to obliquely mention Achilles' impending death (17.192–8). The narrative then switches beats to align the audience with Zeus who *watches* Hektor put on the armour, again emphasized to be Achilles' (17.199). Zeus shouts out to Hektor, his speech illuminating once again the gap between his knowledge (and the audience's knowledge) and Hektor's own, since Zeus knows that 'death is close' to Hektor as he puts on Achilles' armour (ὅς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν ἐστί, 17.202). Zeus recaps Hektor's own actions here: Hektor has killed Achilles' 'strong and gentle' friend and taken his armour (17.204–6 recaps 16.818–57, 17.125–31). But now Zeus also judges those actions, saying that Hektor was out of order for doing these things (οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, 17.205, cf. Hektor's being called οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν at 3.59 = 6.333). This judgement invites the audience to question their own allegiance, to Zeus and to Hektor. Was Hektor out of order in stripping the armour from Patroklos? The ambiguity raises another place that audience allegiance to Hektor might come into question. But still, Zeus says that he will give Hektor great strength now, as a kind of consolation for the fact 'that (Hektor) won't come home out of the fighting, / for Andromache to receive the famous arms of Peleus's son' (ὅ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκνοστήσαντι/ δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος, 17.207f.; for women receiving armour, cf. Hektor's prayer for Astyanax at 6.481f., and

Euphorbos's wish to Menelaos at 17.39f.). It matters that it is Zeus, and not Hektor himself here, who reminds us of Hektor's wife Andromache, and the terrible consequences that his death will bring, lending another perspective on that episode in Book 6, now many hours ago. Zeus's distance constructs audience pity for Hektor.⁵¹ And this scene following immediately on the narrative statement about Achilles' own death links the two men and confirms their inevitable fates.

Overhaul-ish: 17.210–36

The scene switches to Hektor, now armed himself in Achilles' armour and possessed by the war god Ares (17.210–12). But this 'overhaul' does not resemble those of the past. Hektor does not become something else: there are no outward physical changes (cf. 15.607–9), no failures on the parts of others to recognize him (cf. 5.175), no one recognizing that Hektor is now possessed or accompanied by a god (cf. 5.601–4). If anything, Hektor becomes *more* Hektor. He lines up his allies, in a catalogue that introduces or reintroduces Mesthles, Glaukos, Thersilochos, Medon, Deisenor, Hippothoös, Asteropaios, Phorkys, Chromios, and Ennomos, building up audience anticipation that these men will play roles in the battle sequence to come (17.216–8). Hektor exhorts them, playing on Zeus's mentioning Andromache in the previous beat (17.208), as he says he has asked his allies here so that they 'might, thinking kindly, protect the Trojans women and children from the war-loving Achaians' (ἄλλ' ἵνα μοι Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα/ προφρονέως ῥύοισθε φιλοπολέμων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν, 17.223f.). Hektor's other motivations stand in contrast to every criticism of Agamemnon (cf. 1.225): Hektor claims that he does not want more stuff (17.221). In fact, he has been giving all his stuff away, so that he might make his allies strong and accomplish the goal of protecting the most vulnerable of Troy (17.225f.). So Hektor's speech gives the audience access to his motivations, or, at the very least, his claimed motivations. Then, Hektor urges the men to live or die, but that whoever grabs Patroklos's corpse or turns back Aias, will have the same glory as him, and share in half the spoils (17.229–32). Is Hektor's promise to take half the spoils from whoever captures Patroklos's corpse consistent with his claim in this same speech that he does not want any more stuff? This leaves another character ambiguity that the audience has to grapple with. Still, with Hektor setting this mission to retrieve Patroklos's corpse, the game is back on.

The narrator keeps the audience attached to the Trojan allies as they hopefully charge and try to capture Patroklos's body, before commenting that '(Aias) would rob many of their lives over the corpse' (ἢ τε πολέσσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ θυμὸν ἀπήύρα, 17.236). So the audience knows that Hektor's mission, for his men to capture the corpse of Patroklos, does not stand much of a chance.

Aias/Menelaos: 17.237–61

Then the scene switches audience alignment to Aias, whose speech to Menelaos reinforces the image of the new more-Hektor-than-Hektor that the narrative constructed in the previous beat. Aias tells Menelaos that he is more scared for their own lives than he is for Patroklos's corpse, naming Hektor as the source of his fear, calling him a 'cloud of war that covers everything' (ἐπεὶ πολέμοιο νέφος περὶ πάντα καλύπτει/Ἔκτωρ, 17.243f.). Aias tells Menelaos to call the troops and he complies, so that the narrative gives us another mini-catalogue of men on the Achaian side: Oïlean Aias, Idomeneus, and Meriones (17.256–9). Then the narrator gives up naming names (17.260f.), as if three were quite enough for now, since he just gave the audience ten Trojan-ally names a couple of minutes ago (17.216–8).⁵² Does the audience know this routine too well? Is this narrative shorthand for 'catalogue'? Even without a complete catalogue, as with catalogues before, this one marks out the protagonists of the coming battle sequence, and builds audience anticipation for that battle.

Battle: 17.262–369

The next beat keeps the audience attached to the Trojans, with Hektor in the lead, as they pour onto the Achaian ranks guarding Patroklos's corpse. But the scene switches suddenly to Zeus, who drifts a mist over the battlefield, as the narrative gives the audience access to him, that he 'did not hate Menoitios's son, as long as he had lived, while he was henchman of Aiakides, and he hated for him to become a spoil for the Trojan dogs, so he roused his companions to defend him' (17.271–3). This mist seemingly enacts Aias's reading of Hektor as a 'cloud of war' (17.243). Zeus also re-defines Patroklos *through* his relationship to his father, and to Achilles: socially embedding Patroklos in this way adds continuing *pathos* to his death, and builds audience anticipation for Achilles' discovery and response to his friend's death. At the same time, Zeus's intervention on Patroklos's behalf

shows his allegiance to both sides, since the audience knows that he just gave Hektor the extra strength that has allowed for the Trojans' fresh attack (17.206–8). Zeus's playing both sides meta-poetically speaks to how the narrative shifts its own attention and, subsequently, the audience's alignment and allegiance, back and forth between the Trojans and the Achaians, particularly in the battle scenes. We can compare this to modern serial narratives like *Game of Thrones* in how it keeps audiences engaged: 'At its best, the series draws us in completely, allowing us to root for multiple people on multiple sides of a conflict *even when they change sides*.'⁵³ More, Zeus intervenes because of his own emotional relationship to Patroklos, which again places Patroklos's corpse at this centre of intersecting emotional responses.

The narrative now switches rapidly between the sides, with the Trojans driving the Achaians back, and the Achaians abandoning Patroklos (17.274–7), before spoiling that the Achaians will soon successfully rescue the corpse (17.277f.). The narrative then zooms in and aligns the audience with Aias as he leads the Achaian defence; the narrative praises him in reasserting his role as the best of the Achaians in Achilles' absence when he starts to turn the Trojans back again (17.278–87). Then Aias kills Hippothoös (just reintroduced from the catalogue at 17.217) as he tries to capture Patroklos for Hektor and the Trojans (17.289–303). Hektor tries to kill Aias, but hits Schedios (17.304–11); Aias kills Phorkys (just reintroduced from the catalogue at 17.218), and then the Trojans and Hektor give way (17.316). The narrative supplies the contrafactual that the Achaians would have won even beyond the destiny set out by Zeus (ὕπερ Διὸς αἴσαν, 17.321) – if Apollo had not then intervened, pushing Aineias into the action (17.319–22).⁵⁴ So Aineias returns after nearly forty-five minutes' absence (last seen at 16.620–5). Apollo as Periphas exhorts Aineias, telling them that Zeus is more on their side than the others (17.322–32). This creates a moment where the audience must try to remember what side Zeus *is* on here. Aineias recognizes the god and turns to exhort Hektor, shaming the Trojans for their fear, reassuring them that the gods are on their side and reasserting the mission of capturing Patroklos (17.333–41).

The narrative then aligns the audience with Aineias as he kills Leiokritos, a companion of Lykomedes, whom the audience switches to as he kills Apisaon, one of Asteropaios's men (17.344–51). Out of pity, Asteropaios tries to fight with the Achaians, but cannot get close; Aias keeps fighting them back (17.352–9). As the narrative predicted (17.236), many Trojans die around Patroklos's corpse, more than the Achaians, and the ground runs red with their blood (17.360–5). After this last bout of battle, the narrative zooms out to show that Zeus still

shrouds the battlefield around Patroklos's corpse in darkness (17.361–9 recaps 17.271–3).

Bad news travels slow: 17.370–411

The narrator then cuts to the other parts of the field, where the sun is still shining, and Thrasymedes and Antilochos are fighting hard and do not yet know that Patroklos has fallen (17.376–83).⁵⁵ So the narrative once again exploits its melodramatic alignment structure, using these other characters' ignorance of Patroklos's death to build audience anticipation for how they will respond and what they will do when they will find out. The narrative then just as suddenly switches back to those still fighting in the dark over 'the good helper of fast-footed Aiakides' at 17.388, defining Patroklos's corpse once again through his relationship to Achilles (cf. 17.164, 17.204). This relationship not only builds *pathos* into the fight over Patroklos's body, but also creates audience anticipation for Achilles' own emotional response to Patroklos's death, still to come.

This anticipation plays out in the next beat, as the narrative finishes its generalized description of the battle for his body and then looks to Achilles himself, who, like Thrasymedes and Antilochos (17.377–9), still does not know his best friend is dead (17.402). The narrative explains Achilles' ignorance through several points that both re-establish space and relationships and deepen characters (this, coupled with the recaps in the next beats, might allow a break before this beat, though I will argue more strongly below for a break between 17.542 and 17.543).⁵⁶ First, the fighting over Patroklos's corpse takes place near Troy, so far from Achilles, still near his ships (17.403f.). Then, the narrative tells the audience that Achilles did not expect Patroklos to ever try and take Troy, with or without him (17.405–7). This looks back to Achilles' own warning to Patroklos not to take Troy, and his wishes that he and Patroklos alone could sack the city (16.86–100). Finally, the narrator speaks of Achilles' reliance on his mother's divine knowledge. Achilles himself has referenced Thetis's knowledge (1.365), as have others who know him (Nestor at 11.793f. = Patroklos at 16.36f.), so Achilles assumes he would have heard something from Thetis had Patroklos died. But, the narrative says, 'not this time' (δὴ τότε γ' οὐ, 17.410). So in just these couple of minutes, the narrative recaps the fact of Patroklos's death several times; constructs character continuity for Antilochos, Thrasymedes, and Achilles in showing their continuing ignorance, removed as all have been from Patroklos's death and the ensuing fight around his corpse; and, finally, builds explicit

anticipation for these character's emotional responses to discovering that Patroklos is dead.

Horses: 17.412–542

The next scene gives the audience another general overview of the battle, with generic men from either side expressing that side's stand over the corpse (17.412–24).⁵⁷ Then the narrative cuts away from the battle again, to another new emotional response to Patroklos's death, as Achilles' horses, last seen being chased by Hektor (17.71–81), now stand still like a memorial apart from the battle for Patroklos's corpse, weeping for his death (17.426–40).⁵⁸ These horses will become the centre of the next several beats.⁵⁹ The narrator switches the audience's alignment to Zeus as he pities them and speaks to them, lamenting that they, immortal horses, should be given to the mortal Peleus (17.440–5). Then Zeus lays his plans out to the horses, creating audience anticipation for what will come: he will not let Hektor capture them; he will let Automedon escape battle alive; he will give the Trojans glory until they reach the ships again, until sundown (17.448–55). The first fact recaps and reasserts Apollo's earlier statement to Hektor, that his desire for Achilles' horses was futile (17.75–81); the second looks forward to the action in the next beat; the third stands as a long-needed reminder of what time it is and why Zeus still grants Hektor the glory. Zeus did, after all, suggest that 'today' would be the worst for the Achaians (8.470–6), and did promise Hektor the glory until sunset (11.209f.). So in one short beat, the narrative deepens character through emotional responses, while recapping past events in order to emphasize their importance in coming scenes. Finally, Zeus puts strength into the horses' knees, with Automedon fighting from the chariot they pull (17.456–65).

But with Patroklos dead, Automedon cannot control the horses *and* fight on his own in the chariot, so the narrative switches audience alignment to Alkimedon, who sees Automedon struggling and jumps in to help (17.466–3). Their exchange (17.468–80) again recaps the situation that they find themselves in, with Patroklos dead (17.472, 17.477f. recaps 16.818–57) and Hektor wearing his armour (17.472f. recaps 17.210). Then the audience attaches to Alkimedon as he takes up the reins of the horses and Automedon jumps down from the chariot to fight (17.481–3). The narrative then switches audience alignment to Hektor, who, along with Aineias, sees the two men. Their exchange provides the audience access to both men, as Hektor tells Aineias that he hopes to capture the horses.

This coming so soon after Zeus's promise to the horses (17.448f.), let alone Apollo's earlier warning about them to Hektor (17.75–81), lets any audience member know that this is a fool's errand. Nevertheless, the narrative leaves Patroklos aside for a moment, figuratively and literally, as the battle breaks when Hektor and Aineias (accompanied by Chromios and Aretos, 17.494) pursue the horses.

Hektor's speech to Aineias prepares for this mission, as he claims that Automedon and Alkimedon will not be able to stand against Aineias and himself (17.485–90). The narrative then switches the audience's alignment to the other side, where Automedon confirms Hektor's boast, telling Alkimedon that he cannot stand up against Hektor (17.501–6). So he enlists help from Menelaos and the Aiantes against Hektor and Aineias (17.508–15), explicitly asking these Achaians to move away from Patroklos's body, leaving his protection to others (17.508–10).

Now a new battle sequence begins around the horses. Automedon instantly strikes down the just-introduced Aretos (17.517, introduced at 17.494), as Hektor, Aineias, and Chromios get away (17.533–5) and they leave him behind (αὔθι λίπον, 17.535). Here the narrative calls back to its earlier presentations of charioteer-red-shirts, adding Aretos to a long list of dead charioteers.⁶⁰ But as Automedon strips Aretos's body, he ties this present action back to Patroklos, claiming this victory as a small consolation for that death (17.538f.). So even this break with the horses reinforces the stakes and the consequences of the action that has dominated the last battle sequences: the death of Patroklos. The resolution of the horses' fate, first posed at the beginning of this battle sequence (either at 16.864 or at 17.1), means that a performer might choose to take a break here: we will see that there are enough recaps after this break to make this a real possibility, and there are poetic reasons for wanting a break here, rather than between Books 17 and 18.⁶¹

Patroklos: 17.543–625

Almost as if on cue from Automedon claiming his victory for Patroklos (17.538f.), the next scene cuts back to the battle raging over Patroklos's corpse (17.543f.). Now Zeus, shifting his intentions yet again (cf. 17.206–8; 17.271–3), sends Athena to rouse the Achaians (17.545f.).⁶² She disguises herself as Phoinix and exhorts Menelaos, recapping and reiterating his mission to save Patroklos's corpse from mutilation (17.556–9; cf. 17.120–2). Athena/Phoinix also refers to

Patroklos as ‘noble Achilles’ trusted companion’ (Ἀχιλλῆος ἀγαθοῦ πιστὸν ἑταῖρον, 17.558), reinforcing his role (possibly after a break), and further building audience anticipation of Achilles’ discovery of Patroklos’s death.

Menelaos’s response to Athena/Phoinix also recaps and reiterates his own experience of Patroklos’s death; these recaps might compensate for the past ten minutes’ focus on Achilles’ horses, but they would allow for a performance break between 17.542 and 17.543. Menelaos says that he wants to stand and defend Patroklos’s corpse, because ‘his death really affected his heart’ (μάλα γάρ με θανῶν ἐσεμάσαστο θυμόν, 17.564). This recaps the earlier access that the narrator gave the audience to Menelaos, when he stood over Patroklos’s corpse ‘nursing great grief in his chest’ (ἐστήκει, μέγα πένθος ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀέξων, 17.139). Here, Menelaos also says that Zeus still gives Hektor the glory (μάλα γάρ με θανῶν ἐσεμάσαστο θυμόν, 17.566), which, if we accept Zeus’s sending Athena to help the Achaians (17.545f.), suggests that either Menelaos is wrong, or that Zeus continues to support both sides.

The audience’s engagement with trying to recall what side Zeus is on, and how Athena plays into that, is paid off in the next beat, as the narrative switches alignment to Athena. She, happy that Menelaos prayed to her first, makes Menelaos strong (17.567–73), and over Patroklos’s corpse, he kills Podes, whom the narrative intentionally introduces as a close companion of Hektor (17.576f.). This creates an emotional motivation to bring Hektor back into the action around Patroklos’s body, as Apollo as Asios uses Podes’ death to shame Hektor (17.586–90). The narrative makes no effort to create continuity around Hektor – he was last seen giving way to Automedon, not Menelaos, and seemingly still *away* from Patroklos’s corpse (17.533–5, just over five minutes ago), but Podes’ death is enough of an emotional anchor to justify his entrance here. Apollo/Asios rebukes Hektor for allowing Menelaos to kill Podes, since Menelaos ‘was a soft spear-man before’ (ὄς τὸ πάρος γε/ μαλθακὸς αἰχμητῆς, 17.587f.). This wonderfully calls back to the beginning of Book 7, where the narrative told us (almost nine hours ago of performance time without breaks) that Menelaos would have died if he had faced off against Hektor in single combat, since Hektor ‘was much stronger’ (ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν, 7.105). But the πάρος, (before) can also just refer to Menelaos’s struggles before Athena gave him extra strength at 17.569–73: the ambiguity can reward different audience members in different ways, depending on what they remember.

The audience stays aligned to Hektor as his emotional response to Podes’ death drives him back into battle, with Zeus’s terrible aegis and thunder seemingly supporting him (17.593–6). The narrative turns to full battle again,

rapidly switching audience alignments between characters. First Poulydamas wounds Peneleos (17.598–600); then Hektor rushes Leïtos but is struck ineffectually by Idomeneus; then Hektor kills Koiranos, Meriones' charioteer, and Meriones and Idomeneus flee (17.612–25). This last flurry of kills suggests an uptick in Trojan fortune that creates anticipation for an Achaian response.

Bad news travels slow: 17.626–18.21

The next beat cuts to Aias and Menelaos, who see that Zeus helps the Trojans (17.625f.); Aias has not appeared in nearly twenty minutes, not since he was rallying the ranks before the narrative cut to Antilochos and Thrasymedes on the other side of the battlefield (17.360). But Menelaos and Aias have been seen enough together throughout the battle for Patroklos's corpse that it nevertheless creates continuity that Aias still stands near him now, defending the corpse (cf. 17.119–28, 17.237–55, 17.507–15). Aias addresses Menelaos and confirms that he recognizes Zeus's help for the Trojan side (17.631–3). As in his earlier speech to Menelaos, Aias remains more concerned for their own safety than for Patroklos's corpse, since they are alive (17.636–8, cf. 17.240–4). But he comes up with a new plan now to save Patroklos's corpse and their lives: send someone to Achilles. Aias 'doesn't think he's heard the terrible news, that his own companion is dead' (οὐ μιν ὄϊομαι οὐδὲ πεπύσθαι/ λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης, ὅτι οἱ φίλος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος). Aias recaps Achilles' ignorance from the narrative's discussion at 17.403–11, which might too indicate a break after 17.542. But the fact works significantly here, setting a series of missions in motion that the narrative will follow through the next beats. Aias ends his speech with a prayer to Zeus to lift the darkness so that they can find a companion to send on a mission to Achilles (17.643–7). This recaps Zeus's mist, which the narrative last referred to at 17.366–9 (again, suggesting a possible break after 17.542), but which Zeus first put down at 17.268–73. There, he actually put it down to help the Achaians defend Patroklos's body, so the attentive audience member will not think much of the fact that Zeus quickly accedes to Aias's prayer (17.648–50): we might also consider this action indicative of Zeus driving Hektor back again, since Hektor was earlier referred to as a 'cloud' at 17.243f.

With the darkness lifted, Aias sends Menelaos to find Antilochos, if he is still alive, to send to Achilles with the bad news (17.651–5). The audience remains attached to Menelaos on his mission, which perfectly exemplifies a strategic use of the melodramatic alignment structure with many characters across many

geographical locations. There is no reason given for Menelaos not going himself to Achilles, but this allows the narrative to stretch out sideways, and to see if Antilochos is still alive. More, it allows Antilochos to have an emotional response to Patroklos's death that will build further audience anticipation for Achilles' own response.

But Menelaos's reluctance to leave Patroklos's corpse on this mission to find Antilochos is such that the narrative uses an extended simile to describe it (17.656–68) that recalls his tortured speech to himself as he thought of leaving the corpse after Patroklos first died (17.90–105). Menelaos's speech goes even further in character elaboration, as he urges the Aiantes and Meriones, 'everyone must remember Patroklos's kindness – because he understood how to be gentle with everyone . . .' (νῦν τις ἐννεΐης Πατροκλήος δειλοῖο/ μνησάσθω, πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι, 17.670f.).⁶³ Menelaos has already said how much Patroklos's death affected him (17.564; cf. 17.139), now he commands everyone, literally 'anyone' to remember Patroklos's kindness. It invites the audience to remember Patroklos along with the Aiantes. 'Anyone' can easily recall Patroklos stopping to help the wounded Eurypylos, putting his mission for Achilles on hold because someone needed his kindness (11.821–47).

When Menelaos finds Antilochos, he says:

Ἀντίλοχ' εἰ δ' ἄγε δεῦρο διοτρεφὲς ὄφρα πύθηαι
 λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης, ἢ μὴ ὄφελλε γενέσθαι.
 ἦδη μὲν σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν ὄτομαι εἰσορόωντα
 γινώσκειν ὅτι πῆμα θεὸς Δαναοῖσι κυλίνδει,
 νίκη δὲ Τρώων· πέφαται δ' ὄριστος Ἀχαιῶν
 Πάτροκλος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι τέτυκται.
 ἀλλὰ σὺ γ' αἴψ' Ἀχιλῆϊ θέων ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
 εἰπεῖν, αἶ κε τάχιστα νέκυν ἐπὶ νῆα σάωση
 γυμνόν· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ.

'Antilochos, come here, and hear the

terrible news – I wish it hadn't happened.

You've probably already seen Zeus giving pain to the Danaans

and victory to the Trojans. But Patroklos,

the best of the Achaians, has fallen. And the Danaans really miss him.

So run, go tell Achilles, by the Achaians ships.

Maybe he can come fast and, to his own ship, save

the naked body. Because shiny-helmeted Hektor has his armour.'

Menelaos to Antilochos, 17.685–93

Menelaos recaps the prior scenes, with Zeus helping the Trojans, but also Patroklos's death itself, which he, like Aias before him, calls the 'bad news' (λυγρῆς

ἀγγέλῃς, 17.685, cf. 17.642). He packages his own emotional response to the death in with the Danaans, their 'missing' Patroklos (ποθῆ, 17.690). Then he sets the mission for Antilochos, and, in turn, for Achilles. Finally he recaps that Hektor has taken Patroklos's (Achilles') armour (17.693 recaps 17.125–31), making the situation even direr. The narrative then aligns the audience with Antilochos, only to show his stunned silence and his quiet tears as he runs to find Achilles (17.694–702).

With his part of the mission accomplished, the narrative keeps the audience attached to Menelaos, addressing him once again with an apostrophe as he sends Thrasymedes to help the Pylians as he returns to the Aiantes' side (which he left at 17.673). Menelaos recaps having given Antilochos the news to the Aiantes (17.708–10 recaps 17.685–93), but then looks ahead to another potential problem, saying that he does not think that Achilles *can* return to the fight, without armour (17.711). This obliquely recaps Hektor arming in Achilles' armour (17.198f.), having taken it from Patroklos's body (17.125), but also builds audience anticipation for what exactly Achilles will do in order to return to battle. So Menelaos says that they must now devise themselves how to still address the problems discussed in their last interaction (17.634–9): save Patroklos's body and save themselves (17.709–14; cf. 17.238–45). Through teamwork, Menelaos and Meriones carry the body out of the fray, while the Aiantes hold the line against the Trojans (17.722–53). The narrative switches alignment again to the Trojans, with Aineias and Hektor terrifying the rest of the Danaans (17.753–61).

The narrative changes scenes to attach to Antilochos making his way towards Achilles, who sits watching the battle and talking to himself (18.1–14). Achilles' speech recaps the Achaian flight from the previous beat (18.5f. recaps 17.755–9) and guesses that Patroklos might be dead (18.8–12). These recaps would certainly allow for a performance break here, but I am more inclined to have Achilles' response as the culmination of other emotional responses (Menelaos's, Antilochos's) than as a starting point for a new episode, and might still argue for a break after 17.542 instead of between Books 17 and 18. Achilles guesses that Patroklos is dead at least in part because of his mother's prediction that he would die while Achilles still lived (18.9–11);⁶⁴ this plays on the narrative statement that his mother had not told him about Patroklos's death itself (17.408–11). After Achilles has concluded that Patroklos is dead, Achilles ruefully remembers that he had warned Patroklos 'not to fight Hektor by force' (μηδ' Ἐκτορι ἴφι μάχεσθαι, 18.14, recapping 16.87–96). Achilles' warning to Patroklos did not contain any reference at all to Hektor, but it came nearly two hours ago (plus break time), so

while we would certainly remember that Achilles warned Patroklos before he went into battle, it would be harder to remember *exactly* what he had warned Patroklos about. Bringing in Hektor here also plays on our own experience, since we of course know that it was Hektor who killed Patroklos (16.818–56).

This whole speech renders Antilochos's news painfully ironic, as he confirms Achilles' fears, when he tearfully repeats the message (some of it, verbatim) that Menelaos told him to bring Achilles (18.18–21 recaps 17.685–93, 18.19 = 17.686) and finally completes his mission.

Black cloud of grief: 18.22–147

The previous scenes, even the previous 'episode' (however we want to define that episode) since Patroklos's death all lead up to this moment, to this emotional response of Achilles. It does not disappoint. He pours dirt over his face, stretches himself out in the dust, tears at his hair (18.22–7). Achilles' and Patroklos's women join in, running out of doors to Achilles, beating their breasts and fainting (18.28–31). Antilochos weeps and holds Achilles' hands back so that he will not kill himself (18.32–4). This chain of gestures makes the scene particularly memorable,⁶⁵ as the grief for Patroklos focuses through Achilles and spreads outwards, everywhere, even reaching Thetis and the other sea-nymphs, in their sea-caves (18.35–49).

The audience gains access to Thetis's grief, which she soon tells us, is not for Patroklos, but for Achilles himself, who will never make it home to Peleus's house (18.59f.).⁶⁶ She goes to Achilles' side and asks him why he laments, since Zeus has brought everything that he prayed for to fruition, that the Achaians should be pinned against their ships, longing for him (18.74–7 recaps 1.239–44, 1.509f., 8.370, 8.470–6, 13.347–51, 15.74–7). Achilles agrees that Zeus has done what he had asked, but says this it is all for nothing with Patroklos's death (18.79–82). Now Achilles does not want to live, except to kill Hektor as payback for his stripping Patroklos (18.91–3 recaps 18.21, 17.125–31). Achilles himself understands that this will be the death of him, as he tells Thetis (18.88f.); both this and Thetis's statement that Achilles will not make it home elaborate on what he said of Thetis's prophecy to him at 9.410–16.

The narrator gives the audience lots of access to Achilles as he focuses on Hektor throughout these speeches, looking forward to killing him (18.91–3), reflecting on his having killed his companions while he sat apart (18.102–4), and thinks of killing him again, even though it means his own death (18.114–16).

Achilles also claims that he will drive some Trojan woman to lamentation (18.121–5), so building audience anticipation not only for Hektor’s death, but, implicitly, also for the emotional consequences for those women associated with Hektor. Finally, Thetis’s response to Achilles recaps that Hektor wears Achilles’ armour (18.131–3; cf. 17.125, 17.198f.), and reasserts that Hektor’s death is close to him (18.133; cf. 17.202). The beats showing Achilles’ responses to Patroklos’s death could easily fit into an ‘episode’ with the battle sequences from Book 17, as a crescendoing series of emotional responses to Patroklos’s death. At the same time, this beat between Achilles and Thetis also pushes the plot forward in real ways, as Achilles sets out with the new mission to kill Hektor and Thetis sets out on the immediate mission of getting new armour for Achilles. The narrative has spelled out Hektor’s death for some time, but now there is a new focus on Achilles’ death coming fast after Hektor’s own. Death’s long shadow hangs over all the scenes to come, no longer cast by Zeus, but by Achilles himself.

Saving Patroklos: 18.147–238

The scene switches from Thetis on her way to Olympos (18.147), where a performer might take a break, before cutting back to the battlefield (18.148). Here, the narrative works hard to establish continuity for its action and its characters: Hektor still chases the Achaians (18.149f. recaps 17.753–61), and still tries to capture Patroklos’s corpse (18.155f.), while the Aiantes still try to ward him off (18.157–64 recaps 17.747–54). Hektor would have won the body away, the narrative tells us in a contrafactual, if the gods’ messenger Iris had not intervened.⁶⁷

Through this contrafactual, the narrative switches audience alignment to Iris, on a secret mission from Hera, and she tells Achilles to arm (18.165–86). While the previous beat showed the battle raging around Patroklos’s body between Hektor and the Aiantes, Iris reframes it in her diegetic retelling to Achilles, saying that ‘shining Hektor especially rages to drag (Patroklos’s body); and his heart commands him to cut his head from his soft neck and stick it on a stake.’ (μάλιστα δὲ φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ/ ἑλκόμεναι μέμονεν: κεφαλὴν δὲ ἔθυμὸς ἄνωγε/ πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσσι ταμόνθ’ ἀπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειρῆς, 18.175–7).⁶⁸ This does not actually recap the previous beat, but looks back to when Hektor tried to cut Patroklos’s head off back at 17.125–8, around an hour ago of performance time, plus any break time. Iris uses this past image of Hektor, particularly bent on the mutilation of Patroklos’s corpse (Hektor never wanted to put the head on a stake, though – he is no Joffrey from *Game of Thrones*), to convince Achilles to return to the fray.

The exchange between Achilles and Iris allows for several more recapitulations of previous beats. First, Iris reveals that Hera sent her, in secret (18.184–6 recaps 18.167f.). Then Achilles says that he has no armour, and that Thetis has gone to fetch him new armour from Hephaistos (18.188–91 recaps 18.134–7). Iris's response includes another possible wink to audience knowledge, and perhaps even nods to the close proximity of these recaps, when she says, 'Now we all know that they have your famous armour' (εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὅ τοι κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἔχονται, 18.197). She then sets the mission for the next beat, telling Achilles to go to the ditch anyways, without his armour, because even the sight of him might give the Achaians some encouragement (18.198–201); this creates audience anticipation for the next beat.

And, in the next beat, the narrative keeps attached to Achilles as he appears on the battle's sideline, Athena augmenting him so that he is particularly terrifying to the Trojans – now Achilles stands aflame like a signal fire on a far-off island, his voice like the trumpet of a besieging army (18.205–21).⁶⁹ As Iris predicted (18.199–201), this gives the Achaians the space that they need to finally rescue Patroklos's corpse from the battlefield (18.228–38). As Achilles joins the men in mourning Patroklos, the narrative aligns the audience with him, and shows him *seeing* his fallen companion (εἶσίδε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον/ κείμενον, 18.235f.), with the narrator's next lines mirroring what could be Achilles' own thoughts: this is the man whom *he* sent into battle, never to come home again (18.237f.).

Hektor: 18.239–314

The sun sets and the narrative switches alignment to the Trojan side, showing them still recovering from their traumatic encounter with the returned Achilles (18.243–5). The narrative reintroduces Poulydamas at length before he addresses the assembled Trojans: he is Panthoös's son, he is the only Trojan who looks backwards and forwards, he is the same age as Hektor and his companion, but better at speaking than Hektor, while Hektor is better with the spear (18.249–53). Poulydamas has appeared in every book since his introduction in Book 11, but the narrative takes special care here to define who he is, his relationships to Hektor, and his role before he speaks.⁷⁰ So the narrative invites its audience to pay equally special attention to what he says.

Poulydamas starts by urging the Trojans back inside of Troy (18.254f.). His speech follows on his introduction, in that it looks both backwards and forwards: in other words, it perfectly functions within serial narrative, repeating essentials

from previous ‘episodes’ while building audience anticipation for what is to come. Poulydamas recaps Achilles’ anger with Agamemnon (18.257), saying that while Achilles was away, even Poulydamas himself wanted to capture the Achaian ships (18.259f.). This is not entirely true, because Poulydamas told the Trojans *not* to fight by the Achaian ships once he saw the bird-sign (12.200–9). But just the same, Poulydamas’s words here reference his active role in the Trojan campaign against the Achaian battlements and near the ships, particularly in the battle sequences that take place in Books 12 and 13.

Poulydamas recaps this past to contrast with the *now* (νῦν δ’, 18.261), the now where he fears Achilles, where he wants the Trojans to defend Troy from inside its walls. Otherwise the Trojans will be caught on the plain, killed, left as fodder for the birds and dogs (18.261–84). Poulydamas emphasizes what time it is, too: night has fallen (18.267 recalls 18.239–42) and has stopped Achilles, but *tomorrow* . . . (αὔριον, 18.269). So Poulydamas gives the audience a marker of how time has been passing, as will Hektor’s response.

Hektor’s response also recaps important past events, but significantly not ones that have happened in *this* story. Hektor speaks of times that the audience has never seen: the time when the Trojans were under siege in their city (18.287); the time when Troy was famous for its wealth (18.288f.). Like Poulydamas, Hektor contrasts these pasts with the present, and uses that contrast to look forward. Hektor argues that *now* Zeus has allowed him to take glory by the ships, to pin the Achaians against the sea (18.293f.). Hektor rightly remembers Zeus’s allowance to him from 11.207–9, but forgets its limitations: only until the ships; only until sundown. Hektor’s speech, like Poulydamas’s, also reminds the audience that it is night (that sundown from 11.194 and 11.209, reiterated at 17.455, has already come), and that *tomorrow* is a new day (πρῶϊ, 18.303), because he thinks that he can take Achilles tomorrow. This ‘time’ reminder will let the attentive audience know that Hektor’s time is up, despite Hektor’s claims that he will not run away when he faces Achilles, that before Ares has ‘killed the killer’ (18.307–9). If anyone has forgotten Zeus’s orders, or the many signs in the previous episodes that Hektor will die at Achilles’ hands, the narrative helps them out here: the Trojans all applaud Hektor’s terrible advice because Athena robs them of their wits (18.310–12).⁷¹

Black cloud of grief: 18.314–55

The narrative switches audience alignment back to the Achaian camp, and this beat order, from Hektor’s speech about facing Achilles tomorrow to Achilles

mourning Patroklos and promising to kill Hektor tomorrow significantly sets up their coming confrontation. An extended parental simile introduces Achilles' grieving over Patroklos's body (18.318–22, cf. 17.4f., 17.132–6),⁷² reinforcing those scenes from previous episodes that other men, too, felt like this about Patroklos. Achilles, of course, also felt 'parental' about Patroklos before he died (cf. 16.7–11). And Achilles gives the audience further access into that feeling here, when he looks backwards beyond the narrative's own time period to when he told Patroklos's father Menoitios that he would bring his son home alive (18.324–7): this expands upon their backstory that Nestor gave a glimpse of at 11.11.768–98, and further deepens their characters and their relationship. Then Achilles says that Zeus does not bring everything to pass that men would like (18.328 recaps 18.79f.), and repeats that his fate too, will leave him dead here in Troy (18.329–32), which recaps his earlier scene with Thetis (18.52–126). Achilles also elaborates on his previous threats to kill Hektor to avenge Patroklos's death (18.91–3, 18.114–16), as now he tells Patroklos's corpse that he not bury him until he brings him Hektor's head and armour, and sacrifices twelve Trojan youths on his funeral pyre (18.334–7).⁷³ Until then, all their captive women will lament him (18.339f.). With these plans for the dead Patroklos, Achilles builds audience anticipation for future events. The Achaians wash Patroklos's body and mourn for the dead man through the night (18.343–55).

Gods: 18.356–616

The narrative cuts from the grief-stricken Achaians to Zeus and Hera (18.356). The audience aligns with Zeus as he calls out Hera for rousing Achilles (18.357–9), but now, he seems resigned, and no longer threatens his sister-wife (cf. 15.14–33). Hera responds gnominically that everyone always works in their own self-interest:⁷⁴ she hates the Trojans, so of course she would work against them (18.361–7; cf. 4.24–68). The scene is short and sad, but acknowledges that Hera had secretly sent Iris to Achilles to bring him back to the battlefield (recaps 18.165–8). The scene also obliquely recalls Zeus's knowledge of Achilles' return (15.68), so even if Hera was working 'in secret' from Zeus, her actions do not hinder his plans.

While Zeus and Hera talk, the scene cuts to Thetis as she makes her trip to Hephaistos's home, and is greeted by his wife Charis (18.368–90). Hephaistos establishes his relationship and his indebtedness to Thetis with an extensive backstory before they actually speak (18.394–409),⁷⁵ which sets up that

Hephaistos will help Thetis. Their exchange allows Thetis to recap several key plot points from the epic so far (which would also allow for a performance break after 18.147). She repeats her concern for Achilles' short life (18.436–43 = 18.55–62); Agamemnon's offence against Achilles (18.445f. recaps 1.346–56); the Trojan successes near the Achaian ships (18.446–8 recaps Books 13–17); the failed Achaian embassy to Achilles (18.448f. recaps Book 9); Patroklos's entry into battle and the fighting around the Skaian gates and Apollo's killing Patroklos and granting the glory to Hektor (18.451–6 recaps Book 16). These extensive recaps mean that this is another juncture in the narrative where nearly anyone can now join in, while those who have been following all along get a wonderful refresher of what they have experienced so far.

One thing to note is the order of things, which Thetis changes slightly here, suggesting that the Achaians sent the embassy to Achilles only after the Trojans had pinned them against the ships. This point is slightly ambiguous and could encourage more audience engagement in thinking back, since Hektor did not really reach the ships until Book 15, but the Trojans have been fighting outside their city, with the Achaians often behind their ramparts, from Book 8. These reflective moments reward long-time audience members because they play on shared memories. Thetis's divine position and established access to knowledge make it plausible that she, too, knows what we have all been through.

All of these narrative events have led to Thetis having to ask Hephaistos now to make new armour for her son (18.457–61). Hephaistos accedes with a wish (18.464–7), that he might be able to keep Achilles safe when the time came for him to die as surely as he will make Achilles fine armour.⁷⁶ It is a sad thing to say, because it speaks to the impossible. No matter how fine the armour Hephaistos makes for Achilles, it cannot save him from his eventual death.⁷⁷ Hephaistos's construction of Achilles' new armour takes up the rest of the episode, and the narrator's *ekphrasis* of the shield alone takes up ten minutes of performance time. It is, in many ways, a wonderful break.⁷⁸ Away from the death, and the lamentation, and the death to come. Not that the shield is free from death, but it is also imbued with life, with fields in bloom and young people dancing, alongside war and dispute and all other human things. It is a window away from the stifling loss of Patroklos, that must mean the stifling loss of Hektor, that must mean the stifling loss of Achilles himself, already mourned by an immortal mother who will never know death but will know, instead, eternal grief.⁷⁹ The shield ends with the most vibrant, *live-liest* of its scenes: a chorus of dancers and its happy audience, a pair of acrobats leading them all (18.593–605). Only Ocean's great

rim around the shield adds a final note (18.606f.). Hephaistos gives the armour to Thetis, and the audience remains aligned with her as she rushes back down to the ships (18.615f., 19.2f.). The repetition of this action on either side of the Dawn would certainly allow for the performer to take a break at the book division, with Thetis's 'mission' to get new armour from Achilles, which she set out on at 18.146, now resolved.

Make up: 19.1–281

The narrative remains aligned with Thetis as she brings Achilles' new armour to the Achaian camp, with the sun coming up. The armour, too, plays on the epic's melodramatic alignment structure, as a focal object that diverse characters can respond to and reflect on,⁸⁰ allowing for recaps from previous beats and the construction of anticipation for future events. In this role, the armour nearly replaces and certainly complements Patroklos's corpse. Thetis finds Achilles lying in the arms of Patroklos's corpse and begs him to come away from the body and accept the arms, recapping that Hephaistos has made them (19.10f. recaps 18.468–614). The narrative briefly aligns the audience with the other Achaians, who cannot even look at the armour (19.14f.), before switching to Achilles, who gazes at the armour and accepts it willingly (19.15–23).⁸¹ Only, he says, he does not want to leave Patroklos's body to rot (19.23–7).⁸² Thetis replies that she will take care of Patroklos's corpse and that Achilles himself should go and make things up with Agamemnon (19.29–36). So Thetis's response builds audience anticipation for the next several beats.

First, the narrative keeps the audience aligned with Thetis as she herself pours ambrosia into Patroklos's body, so that it will be preserved (19.37f.). Then the narrative follows Achilles as he makes his way across the Achaian camp, introducing and reintroducing characters as he passes them on his promenade. First there are all the men who have never even left the ships, and whom the narrative has never shown (19.42–6): there they are, now that Achilles returns (the narrative has yet to show a fighting Achilles, either).⁸³ Then Diomedes and Odysseus (19.47), both still leaning on their spears in pain from their wounds (19.48 recaps Diomedes' wound from 11.369–78 and Odysseus's from 11.435–8). Agamemnon comes along too, and the narrative explicitly recaps his wound, struck by Koön (19.51–3 recaps 11.248–53). These wounds happened close to seven hours ago in performance time, not including the many breaks that would have happened since then, and these men have not even appeared in nearly four

hours of performance time – they were all last seen wounded and marshalling the men at 14.380.

Achilles addresses Agamemnon and again recaps their quarrel from Book 1, which he now regrets (19.56–62), because it served the Trojans and Hektor (19.63; cf. 18.101–14). Agamemnon, too, regrets his actions, telling an extended story about Hera deluding Zeus to compare to his own delusion (19.91–133), which he reflected on when Hektor and the Trojans were killing his men by their ships (19.134–6).⁸⁴ The mythological paradigm that Agamemnon relays certainly explains his own feelings, but also acts as a callback for audience members, since they have seen (while Agamemnon has not) Hera delude Zeus within this very narrative (14.161–15.8). At the same time, Agamemnon's speech creates the illusion of continuity for his character, as the narrative never provided the audience access to Agamemnon when the fighting was fiercest around the ships, but we might guess that Agamemnon had these thoughts while the narrative was away from him in Books 15–18. Agamemnon then says that he will give gifts to compensate for his delusion (19.137f.), building audience anticipation for this gift-giving to follow. Much of the remainder of this beat sequence centres around social conventions; Agamemnon gives these gifts (the same gifts as 'yesterday' at 19.194f., which recaps 9.262–99) and, at Odysseus's urging, swears an oath that he did not touch Briseis (19.259–68), whom he also returns in front of the assembly. But throughout, the narrative gives the audience access to Achilles' disinterest in these conventions (as well as in dinner), since he is only desperate to return to the fight (19.199–214). Nevertheless, the beats resolve dangling storylines from previous episodes and bring all the Achaian storylines, split in Book 1, back together.

Black cloud of grief: 19.282–356

Amidst the other gifts, now the audience's alignment switches to Briseis, whose return allows another emotional response to Patroklos's death, and demonstrates the narrative once again engaging its melodramatic alignment structure to give its world more depth. Like Achilles' own grief response to Patroklos's death (18.22–7), Briseis memorably responds in a series of gestures, taking Patroklos up in her arms, tearing at her breasts and throat and face (19.281–6).⁸⁵ Briseis says that when she left Achilles' tent last, Patroklos was still alive (19.287f.), a callback to her departure at 1.346–8. Now she finds him dead, and her speech builds her backstory, reflecting on the deaths she has suffered through before – her husband

and three brothers all killed by Achilles (a callback to Andromache's losses to Achilles, cf. 6.414–24) – but Patroklos told her that she would become Achilles' legitimate wife, comforting her (19.290–9). All of this past information creates the illusion of a complete character, even though Briseis has only spoken this one time in the whole of the epic.⁸⁶ Briseis ends by telling the dead Patroklos, 'I'll never stop crying about your death, since you were always gentle' (τὼ σ' ἄμοτον κλαίω τεθνηότα μείλιχον αἰεὶ, 19.300); this looks back to and fulfils Achilles' saying that the captured women would long lament Patroklos (18.338–42). Briseis's lamentation also deepens and reinforces what we know of Patroklos, especially reflecting Menelaos's claim that Patroklos 'knew how to be gentle with everyone' (πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι, 17.671).

The next beats switch audience alignment to further show the diverse grief responses to Patroklos's death. First, the other women join in the lamentation, their grief for Patroklos matched by their grief for themselves (19.301f.). Then, Achilles, too, continues to lament, and also continues to lament himself, as he compares the past with the terrible present and the future that will be even worse. There is the time before, when Patroklos himself might have served Achilles dinner (19.315–18); then there is the time now, when Patroklos lies a torn-up corpse and Achilles cannot eat from his grief (19.319–21); the time before when Achilles had hoped to die alone in Troy, with Patroklos making his way safely back to Phthia to care for Achilles' son (19.328–3); the time now, when Peleus must wait for news that Achilles has died (19.336f.). The audience has seen Patroklos prepare food for Achilles (9.205–17), but has not before seen Achilles' desire to die alone at Troy (cf. 16.58), nor wanting Patroklos to care for his son. These new details of past desires that can no longer be fulfilled continue to add *pathos* to Achilles' character, in deepening his relationship with Patroklos. As Achilles mourns, so, too, do those around him, each remembering their own families (19.338f.). Grief is catching.

The narrative switches the audience's alignment to Zeus, following his gaze: he pities the mourning Achaians and sends Athena down to imbue Achilles with ambrosia because he has not eaten (19.338–56).

Armour and horses: 19.357–503

The narrative aligns the audience with Athena as she fills Achilles with ambrosia while the other Achaians are arming, and so he arms too (19.352–64). Like other arming sequences, here the narrative invites a kind of intense alignment with

Achilles, creating audience investment in his character and building anticipation for his participation in the coming battle. Achilles' arming sequence recaps that Hephaistos made his new armour (19.369, 19.383 recaps 18.474–612). But he also grabs up his massive ash spear (19.387–91), which calls back to Patroklos's own arming scene, where he left the spear because only Achilles could wield it (16.139–44). Here, the same lines are repeated, but of course, Achilles *can* wield the great spear (16.141–4 = 19.388–91). In the next beat, Automedon and the newly introduced Alkimos get his horses ready, showing continuity for Automedon, who was closely associated with Achilles' horses for most of Book 17 and was last seen stripping Aretos and leaving the battlefield on Achilles' chariot (17.536–42). Now Automedon will serve as Achilles' charioteer (19.395f.).

As Achilles prepares to rush onto the battlefield, he chastises his horses for having left Patroklos on the battlefield (19.400–3); like the reintroduction of Automedon, this calls back to Book 17, where Zeus comforted the horses in their grief and promised them (along with Automedon) safe return to the camp. This recall might add to audience allegiance and how and if they judge the horses along with Achilles. The horse Xanthos, whom Hera gives voice to, replies (19.404–17), defending his team and again recapping Patroklos's death (19.411–14 recaps 16.818–63) when he says that Apollo killed Patroklos and 'gave the glory to Hektor' ('Εκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε, 19.414). Xanthos begins and ends his speech with the fact that Achilles will die, and it will not be the horses' fault (19.409f.; 19.416f.). Achilles' response winks to the audience, who, like him, already knows this: 'Xanthos, why are you prophesying my death? You really don't need to. I also now know, all too well, that my fate's to die here . . .' (Ἐάνθε τί μοι θάνατον μαντεύεαι; οὐδέ τί σε χρή./ εὖ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὃ μοι μῶρος ἐνθάδ' ὀλέσθαι, 19.420f.; cf. 18.95f., 18.98f., 18.114–16).⁸⁷ The book ends with Achilles, here, with his horses, ready for battle; a break here would not be impossible, but would certainly be a cliffhanger, and this book division notably serves as the only 'break' between an arming sequence and the subsequent action.⁸⁸

Battle (Achilles)

Books 20 through 22 represent a nearly continuous action from Achilles' entering battle hell-bent on revenge against Hektor and his enactment of that revenge. This singular purpose, even more focused than the Trojan assault on the battlements, or again, on the ships, makes it difficult to judge where 'episodes' lie:

there are few new plot developments during this time, and Patroklos's death at Hektor's hands is the only past plot point truly essential to understanding Achilles' actions now. Just the same, the narrative cleverly uses a variety of techniques to draw out the escalation towards Achilles' final confrontation with Hektor. Just as in the battle books, the narrative makes good use of its multiplicity of geographies and characters: the Trojan flight from Achilles' rage engages the rivers that cross the Trojan plains and Troy itself, with the characters related to each and the divine sphere continuing to be active. But still, the tight focus on Achilles through these books means that the rest of the Achaians fade once more into the background. The momentum towards the epic's end also means that some major characters begin to make their 'last' appearances: as other serial narratives do, the *Iliad* gives its primary characters that it does not kill off final scenes that give some clue as to the character's fate: curtain calls.⁸⁹

Gods take sides: 20.1–75

Book 20 begins with an apostrophe,⁹⁰ as the narrator addresses Achilles, recapping that the Achaians are arming all around him (20.1f. recaps 19.351f.). If there is no break between the books here in the performance, this apostrophe, the only time that the narrator addresses Achilles directly, might increase the audience's concern for him going into battle, so soon after his horses' prediction of his impending death.⁹¹ The narrative briefly switches audience alignment to show that the Trojans, too, are arming (20.3), before switching again to Zeus (20.4). In this one minute of performance, the narrator 'checks-in' with the three story spaces currently in play: the Achaian army, the Trojan army, and the gods. This would further allow for a possible break between Books 19 and 20.

The audience remains aligned with Zeus as he gathers the gods and encourages them to join the battle on whatever side they want (20.4–25); this reverses past actions where Zeus fought to keep all the gods out of battle (8.5–27) or fought to keep the gods from interfering with his own plans (Books 13–15), and sets up the following beats. Zeus's speech claims that Achilles is so strong now with his grief that the Trojans will not hold him off for long, and he might now sack Troy beyond his destiny (20.26–30). This speech reiterates the fact of Patroklos's death and its emotional consequences for Achilles, while introducing the fact that Achilles' grief has real possible consequences for Troy; but this also plays off traditional knowledge that Achilles will not sack Troy.⁹² So the gods choose sides: Hera, Athena, Poseidon, Hermes, and Hephaistos for the Achaians; Ares, Apollo,

Artemis, Aphrodite, Leto, and Xanthos for the Trojans (20.31–40). Like other mini-catalogues in the past, this catalogue introduces (or reintroduces) characters that will play roles in the beats to come. Before the gods join in the battle, the Achaians have the clear advantage, as terror takes the Trojans when they see Achilles (20.41–6; cf. 18.217–29). The gods join the battle, each squaring off against another: Poseidon takes on Apollo, Ares against Athena, Hera against Artemis, Leto against Hermes, and finally, Hephaistos against the river-god Xanthos (20.47–75). For many of these gods, this coming battle will be their last appearance in the *Iliad*.

Achilles/Aineias: 20.75–352

The narrative switches the audience's alignment back to Achilles. Here we find him mid-action as he tries to get to Hektor on the battlefield: this implies that the battle has started in this gap where we have been away from the battlefield, with the gods (20.75–8; cf. 20.1f.). Now the narrator gives us access to Achilles' motivations and implicitly recaps Patroklos's death again, as his anger drives him most of all against Hektor (20.75–8). But Apollo significantly pushes Aineias towards him instead (20.79–82), building up his character while keeping audience anticipation going for the inevitable confrontation between Achilles and Hektor.

The narrative switches the audience's alignment to Apollo, who now disguises himself as Priam's son Lykaon (20.81f.), recalling other scenes of Apollo in disguise (cf. 16.721–5; 17.75–81), and here he chides Aineias for not standing up to Achilles (20.83–5). 'Lykaon' refers to a time when Aineias boasted that he would take on Achilles: the audience has no memory of that, but they might remember Hektor's boast that *he* would face Achilles (18.305–9). Aineias's response recounts the last time that he tried to take on Achilles, near Lyrnessos, where Achilles (with Athena's help) almost killed him (20.87–102). This kind of backstory gives Aineias's character more depth, constructing a history for him outside the poem (but not, necessarily, outside of tradition).⁹³ That the audience has already heard of some of Achilles' exploits at Lyrnessos helps create credence (cf. 2.690f., 19.60), a reality to this storyworld. His near-loss to Achilles at Lyrnessos also provides Aineias some justification for his hesitation here, though Apollo quickly tells him there is no need to be so reluctant, since Aineias's mother is a higher goddess than Achilles' mother is (20.104–9). So the exchange reintroduces Aineias, deepens his character, and reinforces his role. The narrative

takes this time with Aineias not just because he appears now for the first time in around an hour and half of performance time (17.758), but also because his prominent role in this coming episode will serve as his curtain call as the epic starts winding down.

The narrative switches audience alignment to the gods, where Hera watches Aineias heading to face off against Achilles and approaches Poseidon and Athena: they decide to stay out of the fighting unless Ares or Apollo joins in, and they go off to Herakles' house (20.144–52).⁹⁴ This clears the scene for a one-on-one match between Achilles and Aineias, soon after the gods had decided to take part in the fighting (20.31–40).

The narrative builds anticipation for their fight even further with an extended simile and a long exchange between the two men, creating further audience allegiance with these characters before their actual fight. Achilles speaks first, and also makes reference to that one time outside Lyrnessos where he almost killed Aineias (20.187–94; cf. 20.89–92): that Achilles shares this character memory with Aineias makes their shared past all the more real. Achilles ends his speech by inviting Aineias to run away: these are the same lines that Menelaos said to Euphorbos over Patroklos's corpse (21.196–8 = 17.30–2). Menelaos's proposed 'survival option' to an enemy seemed to reflect on Menelaos's personality (cf. 6.51–3): here, it draws on this shared backstory where Aineias has run away from Achilles before; it speaks to Aineias's necessary survival, dictated by tradition; and it confirms that Achilles directs his rage especially at Hektor (20.77).

Aineias pushes Achilles' invitation aside as he starts in on what should be his genealogy (cf. 6.121–211), but is not, in another wink to anyone who realizes how famous these two characters are. There is no need to detail their genealogies anyways, since Apollo has already named both of their mothers (20.104–9), but Aineias's inclusive pronouns here feel like a particular acknowledgement of the audience and their knowledge, since 'we know each other's origins, and we know our famous parents, listening to the poems of mortal men' (ἴδμεν δ' ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας/ πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, 20.203f.).⁹⁵ Aineias goes ahead and repeats their parentage anyway (20.205–9). Then Aineias goes into a more extended genealogy that explains his position in Troy, and delineates his genealogy apart from Hektor's, his ancestry being from another branch than Priam's, that of Dardanos (20.215–41); for the audience familiar with Hera's focused hatred (cf. 4.28), this also explains why he will survive.

In the next beat, the fight finally begins. Aineias tries to strike Achilles' shield with his spear, which allows the narrative to reiterate that Achilles' armour is

divine and cannot be broken, with its five folds (20.261–72 recaps 18.478–82). In contrast, Achilles' spear goes straight through Aineias's shield and past him (20.276–81). Aineias charges with stone in hand, Achilles with sword. The narrative tells us that Aineias's stone would have bounced right off Achilles' armour and that Achilles would have killed Aineias (20.288–90).⁹⁶

But instead the narrative switches audience alignment to Poseidon and builds anticipation for another intersection between storylines as his speech to the gods declares that Aineias's destiny is to survive,⁹⁷ while Zeus has cursed Priam's family (20.302–8). This reinforces the significance of Aineias's separate lineage from the previous beat (20.213–41). The curse against Priam's family also adds divine weight to Achilles' mission against Hektor, Priam's son (cf. 20.75–7; 20.240). Hera claims that she and Athena have sworn oaths against helping any of the Trojans, even on the day when their city burns to the ground (20.310–17), giving further backstory to the gods, and further characterization to Hera.⁹⁸ So Poseidon goes to save Aineias, warning him to take care until after Achilles dies (20.337–9). These exchanges stretch the *Iliad's* storyworld in multiple directions – to the past where gods threw curses and took oaths and to the future when Troy falls, Achilles dies and Aineias survives. So the *Iliad* leaves Aineias, but makes sure to signal his extra-epic fate, at the end of this, his last appearance, his curtain call.

Hektor/Achilles: 20.353–454

After Aineias's rescue, the narrative follows Achilles as he turns back to the fight, exhorting the Achaians to keep fighting, as he cannot fight everyone alone (although Achilles is the only Achaian who features heavily through this battle sequence; 20.254–64). The narrative switches audience alignment mid-line to Hektor, appearing after about twenty minutes of performance time (20.76), who also exhorts his men (20.366–72). Hektor's speech focuses almost exclusively on Achilles. He tells his men not to fear 'the son of Peleus' (μη δειδιτε Πηλεΐωνα, 20.366), which responds directly to Achilles' speech and creates continuity for the Trojans troops, recapping their fear of Achilles from 20.44–6. Then Hektor denies that Achilles will get everything that he wants (οὐδ' Ἀχιλεὺς πάντεσσι τέλος μύθοις ἐπιθήσει, 20.369), but only some of what he wants (20.370). This statement's ambiguity invites audience engagement, as they try to piece together from memory what Achilles does want, besides the death of Hektor (20.75–8). Then Hektor claims that he himself will stand against Achilles (τοῦ δ' ἐγὼ ἀντίος εἶμι, 20.371), repeating his determination from the previous evening's assembly

(18.305–9). Finally, Hektor describes Achilles as having hands like fire, his battle-fury like a flaming sword (20.371f.); his use of the epanalepsis ‘his hands like fire’ (εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικεν, 20.371f.) picks up on the image of the flaming Achilles from his reappearance and from his arming sequence (18.203–14; 19.375–83).⁹⁹ Hektor’s whole speech builds audience anticipation for the confrontation between the two men. But the confrontation is not to be, as Apollo comes and tells Hektor to avoid a fight with Achilles, and Hektor disappears back into the Trojan throng (20.375–80; cf. 11.202–5).¹⁰⁰

The narrative then keeps the audience aligned with Achilles as he kills Iphition, Demoleon, Hippiodamas, and Polydoros in quick succession (20.381–418). The narrative introduces Polydoros as Priam’s youngest son – beloved, fast of foot (20.407–10) – before Achilles kills him, eviscerating him with his spear so that falling on his knees, Polydoros grabs at his spilling guts (20.413–9). Here, the narrative switches alignment again, following Hektor’s gaze as he sees Polydoros’s death. The narrator’s extended introduction of Polydoros gives Hektor justification to jump back into the battle despite Apollo’s warning at 20.376–8, as Hektor can ‘no longer stand it’ (οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔτ’ ἔτλη, 20.421) when he sees his brother die grabbing at his guts (20.419–21). He goes to face Achilles, and now he, too (like Achilles’ association with fire before him, 20.371f.), is like a flame (φλογὶ εἵκελος, 20.423, cf. 13.53).

As the narrative builds towards this confrontation, it switches the audience’s alignment again, back to Achilles, who sees Hektor making his way towards him. Now Achilles recaps his emotional relationship to Hektor: ‘The man comes close who has affected my heart the most, who struck down my cherished companion.’ (ἐγγὺς ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμόν γε μάλιστ’ ἐσεμάσσατο θυμόν,/ ὅς μοι ἐταῖρον ἔπεφνε τετιμένον, 20.425f.). Achilles’ language calls back to Menelaos’s own claim that Patroklos’s death ‘really affected his heart’ (17.526), while reinforcing the fact that Hektor was the one to kill Patroklos (16.818–57).

The narrative switches back to Hektor for his response, and provides the audience access to his fearlessness against Achilles (20.430). His response first mirrors that of Aineias’s (20.431–4 = 20.200–3), but instead of the genealogies of that scene, here Hektor just says that he knows that he is weaker than Achilles (20.434) a pathetic surprise for the audience. But he repeats the sentiment that he told the Trojan assembly the night before, when he says that the gods might still give him victory (20.435–7; cf. 18.309).

The fight between them begins. Athena helps Achilles and blows back Hektor’s thrown spear, while Apollo wraps Hektor in a mist and saves him (20.438–54), much like Aineias with Poseidon before him (20.321–9). The scene ends with Achilles looking forward to their next encounter (20.449–54).

Kill, kill, kill: 20.455–21.33

Now that both Aineias and Hektor have been spirited out of Achilles' way, the next beats keep the audience aligned with him as he kills Trojans: Dryops, Demouchos, Dardanos, Laogonos, Tros, Moullos, Echecklos, Deukalion, Rhigmos, Areithoös (20.455–89). Tros tries to supplicate Achilles, but the narrator calls him a fool, saying that Achilles 'was a not a sweet-hearted man, not mild-mannered, but altogether eager' (οὐ γὰρ τι γλυκύθυμος ἀνὴρ ἦν οὐδ' ἀγανόφρων, / ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἐμμεμαώς, 20.467f.). Achilles on his chariot moves across the plain, crushing and cutting corpses beneath his chariot wheels, 'his invincible hands spattered in gore' (20.495–503). This vivid image of Achilles would certainly make a strong cliffhanger, but there is very little to mark out the action of Book 20 as an episode: it is barely recapped in Book 21, and nothing 'resolves' in this book, except, perhaps, that two of the strongest warriors on the Trojan side – Aineias and Hektor – cannot stand up to Achilles in single combat.

Over the book division, the narrative switches audience alignment to the Trojans (here, unnamed) that Achilles has chased across the plain and as they reach the river Xanthos, where Achilles splits them and chases them back towards the city (21.1–4). In describing Achilles' chase across the plain, the narrator refers to Hektor's victories there yesterday: this recap creates a sharp juxtaposition between the two men, and the two days, ominously emphasizing that *today* is not Hektor's day (cf. 11.185–209).¹⁰¹ This also signals that the next actions will take place in and around the river,¹⁰² who just like the Achaian wall before it, becomes a type of character with its own past and future. Xanthos exists as a focal point of action as well as an agent (cf. 20.40, 20.73f.) who will come into play in the following beats: the river's arc might be why this book has been considered an 'episode'.¹⁰³ But in these first beats, the river serves as the site where the audience remains aligned with Achilles through his terrible slaughter. There are no names for these Trojans that Achilles kills: they are like locusts before a fire, like little fish before a dolphin (21.12–26). Achilles kills enough of them that the waters run red with blood. When Achilles tires of killing, he chooses twelve of these nameless Trojans to be the sacrifices he promised Patroklos for his funeral pyre (21.26–8 recaps 18.336f.): this detail reasserts the reason for Achilles' killing, bringing back the image of the dead Patroklos onto this present field, affecting audience allegiance as they judge his actions against the background of Patroklos's death.

Sleeping with the fishes: 21.34–210

As the narrator did with Hektor back in Book 6, now it aligns the audience with Achilles through a series of encounters that show his variable attributes and deepen his character. This is particularly important after his long absence from the epic's action, and builds anticipation and audience investment in his eventual confrontation with Hektor. First Achilles comes across Lykaon, Priam's son (21.33f.), escaping, again, the river (21.35). Apollo disguised himself as Priam's son Lykaon in order to address Aineias in the last episode (21.81f.). Now the man himself appears, and he, like Aineias, also has a past with Achilles, who captured him in his father's orchards and ransomed him alive (21.35–8). Achilles' absence from the battlefield for most of the epic necessitates these extra-epic pasts to deepen his character, as the audience has spent little time with him.

The narrative remains with Achilles when he sees Lykaon: he is surprised, and talks to himself, providing another opportunity to recap the fact that Achilles ransomed this man to Lemnos, before expressing a seemingly casual curiosity as to whether Lykaon can also return from death itself (21.54–63). The backstory between the two men creates a new context against which Lykaon tries to supplicate Achilles. Tros had made a similar attempt a few beats ago, and there the narrative explained that it was wrong of him to try, because of the kind of man Achilles was (20.463–72). Here, Lykaon supplicates Achilles, reminding him again of the fact that he ransomed him the last time that he caught him. Lykaon significantly adds that he is not from the same womb as Hektor, who killed Achilles' strong and gentle companion (21.95f.). Lykaon identifies Hektor as Patroklos's killer the same way that Zeus himself did when he shook his head at Hektor's putting on Patroklos's armour (21.96 = 17.204). But Lykaon's backstory also shows that Achilles has, in the past, ransomed his captives, like he had with Andromache's mother (6.425–7). Achilles himself explains to Lykaon that he was happy enough to let people go before Patroklos's death, but now everyone will die, because even he will die (21.99–113); he defines his own character as having been transformed. And he kills Lykaon, his body to be carried off by the river, a feast for the fishes (21.114–27): everyone, Achilles says, will die, to pay for Patroklos's death when he was not with him (21.128–35). So Achilles repeats his own regret as he links once more his companion's death with his own absence from the battlefield (21.134f. recaps 18.101–4). The beat uses the character interaction between Achilles and Lykaon to construct a past against which Achilles can now be compared, creating the illusion of

character development by building depth into this single scene:¹⁰⁴ this makes up for the fact that the audience themselves have not seen Achilles change. This construction of Achilles' character starts from Patroklos's death and looks forward to Hektor's.

Now the audience aligns with the river, before simply a locale and the receptacle for Achilles' kills (including Lykaon, 21.120f.), as he acts, inspiring Asteropaios to confront Achilles, enraged over all the dead young men in his waters (21.139–47 recaps 21.7–26). Asteropaios has not appeared since 17.352, so here the narrative reintroduces him by his name, by his father and, significant for these next beats, by his relationship to the river Axios (21.140–3). Achilles then asks Asteropaios who he is, and Asteropaios's response further elaborates his identity (21.154–60), as he repeats who his father is and what his relationship is to the river, while he also emphasizes his role as the leader of the Paionians (21.154f. recaps 17.350f.). Through these repetitions the narrator builds character recognition for Asteropaios. Achilles kills him, and, in a variation on other fight scenes (cf. 6.123–211; 20.200–40), gives his own genealogy to Asteropaios's corpse: Zeus trumps the rivers (21.184–99). Then he leaves the corpse to the fish and the eels (21.200–4), just as he did with Lykaon in the last beats (21.26f.).¹⁰⁵ So Achilles, having taken out the Paionian leader Asteropaios, runs after his men (21.205–8), the audience following with him as he kills Thersilochos, Astypylos, Mydon, Mnesos, Thrasios, Ainios, and Ophelestes (21.209f.).

When rivers attack: 21.211–382

The beat switches through a contrafactual as the narrator tells us that Achilles would have killed more Paionians still if the river Xanthos had not intervened (21.211–13).¹⁰⁶ So Xanthos becomes a full-fledged character that stands and speaks to Achilles. The dialogue between Xanthos and Achilles allows the narrator to re-establish the goals for the next several beats: Xanthos wants an end to his waters being clogged with corpses (21.214–21), Achilles will keep killing until the Trojans are inside their city and he has taken on Hektor in single combat, whatever the outcome (21.223–6).

After Achilles' refusal to stop killing Trojans until he gets what he wants, the narrative switches audience alignment to Xanthos as he attacks him (21.227). Xanthos also turns to Apollo here to chastise the god for not defending the Trojans as he had promised Zeus (21.228–32). Xanthos's rebuke raises questions

for the audience here, in recapping that Zeus had ordered Apollo to protect the Trojans until sundown (21.231f. recaps 15.231–5): but Xanthos inserts the ‘sunset’ detail, seemingly conflating this with Zeus’s earlier orders to honour Hektor until sundown (the previous day) at 11.192–4. The narrative does not bring Apollo in here to respond, so the audience that knows that Zeus’s orders for Apollo to help the Trojans has already expired will now perhaps guess that Xanthos’s appeals here are futile.

After this rebuke for an absent Apollo, Xanthos unleashes his full attack on Achilles (21.240f.). This divine attack reveals Achilles’ fear of death in a way that his previous encounters with Aineias, Hektor, Lykaon, and Asteropaios could not have. Running from Xanthos’s waves, fearing for his life, the narrator aligns the audience with Achilles as he prays to Zeus (21.269–83). Achilles’ prayer focuses on his death in a way that recaps important past events, builds audience anticipation for his actual death, and deepens his character. His fear of death is such that he thinks Thetis must have lied to him when she told him he would be struck down by Apollo’s arrows beneath Troy’s walls (21.275–9): this adds details to previous information about Achilles’ death, and plays to a traditional audience who would know that Thetis certainly did not lie.¹⁰⁷ Achilles then wishes that Hektor himself had killed him here (21.279f.): Achilles’ allowance of a circumstance where Hektor *could* kill him brings back Hektor’s statements from previous episodes that he might kill Achilles (18.309, 20.435–7), building further anticipation for their inevitable confrontation, and raising some doubts to the inevitability of that confrontation’s outcome.¹⁰⁸ Finally, Achilles compares himself to a boy swineherd, at risk of being washed away in a flood (21.281–3), a poetic self-presentation of vulnerability and desperation.

Athena and Poseidon come and console Achilles, confirming that the river will not kill him, that the river will stop, and that he himself will see Xanthos stop (21.288–2); they also tell Achilles that things will play out the way *he* wanted them to (21.224–6), so he should not stop fighting until he drives the Trojans back to Troy and kills Hektor (21.294–7). Only then should he return to his ships. This speech looks back to Achilles’ concern while spelling out the action of the next beats. But it will take some time yet for the river to stop. First Xanthos enlists his brother Simoeis to his cause (21.300–27); then Hera commands Hephaistos to work against both of them, unleashing great fire across the rivers and the plains (21.328–82). The river finally relents, swearing the same oath to Hera that she and Athena said they themselves had sworn: never to help the Trojans (21.374–6 = 20.315–17).

God-fight: 21.383–525

While the river relents, the narrative bounces audience alignment between the rest of the gods, who get angry and brawl (21.385–520); this scene serves as a curtain call for several of the gods who will not play a significant role in the final episodes of the epic. Ares and Aphrodite are both knocked down by Athena (at Hera's urging), in a clear callback to their defeats at the hands of an Athena-backed Diomedes back in Book 5: Ares makes specific reference to Diomedes' earlier victory as a motivation for calling out Athena (21.395–9 recaps 5.855–61). The confrontations between Diomedes and the gods took place over twelve hours of performance time ago, without breaks – probably a previous day of performance – which would make this a rewarding callback for attentive audience members, and a fitting curtain call for Ares and Aphrodite.

Poseidon and Apollo are up next; they were also matched against one another when the gods first rejoined the fray at 20.67f. Poseidon proposes to Apollo that they should fight, bringing up the time when they both worked for the Trojans and Laomedon ripped them off, wondering why Apollo still helps the Trojans (21.436–60). Poseidon's complaint focuses on his wall-building for Laomedon, an oblique callback to his earlier complaints to Zeus about the Achaian wall (7.446–63). But Apollo dismisses Poseidon out of hand, because mortals are not worth fighting over (21.462–7). More divine arguments follow, between Artemis and Hera, nearly between Hermes and Leto. The god-fight lasts for about ten minutes of performance time and serves as a comic-ironic break from Achilles' killing, since no matter what these gods do, they cannot die.¹⁰⁹ The scenes spell out how low the stakes are for the gods in contrast with how high those same stakes are for the men in whose lives they intervene. Only Apollo and Athena will continue to play active roles in the epic's remaining episodes.

The narrative switches the audience's alignment to Apollo, following him down to Troy, giving access to his concern for the Trojans (21.515–17), successfully transitioning from the god-fight back to the mortal realm. Here the narrative also creates continuity with Achilles, absent from the narrative since Hephaistos intervened with the river (21.341), now once again destroying the Trojans (21.520–5; cf. 21.209–13). If the beginning of Book 21 does serve as the start of an episode that revolves around the conflict between Achilles and the river, it has now resolved; this would allow for a performance break here. If a performance went straight over the book division, the end of the god-fight would still present an opportunity to break, as the narrative summarises Achilles' great rampage across the plain that has taken up much of the past beat sequences (21.520–5).¹¹⁰

Defender of Troy: 21.526–22.6

With Achilles' fight with the river and the god-fight that emerges out of it coming to a resolution, it would be possible to take a performance break after 21.525. Then the narrative switches alignment to Priam, on the walls of Troy, and what he sees and how he responds to it recaps Achilles' chase of the Trojans. Priam sees Achilles approach the city, scattering the Trojans before him (21.526–8 recaps 21.520–5). He runs down to the gates and orders that they be opened, allowing the tired Trojans to pour back into their city, with Apollo guarding their path and Achilles still chasing after them (21.528–43). The narrative switches scenes out of Troy with a contrafactual that pushes Antenor's son Agenor into Achilles' path, stopping the Achaians from capturing Troy (21.544–6).

Agenor has appeared in the narrative several times before, particularly in the Trojan assault of Books 11–16, but never in a major action: so he is recognizable enough to matter, but not too much to emotionally distract in the build up to the final confrontation between Hektor and Achilles. Before actually confronting Achilles, Agenor considers running away, but then decides to take Achilles on even if he is stronger (21.553–70; cf. Hektor at 20.434–7). After all, Achilles is still mortal, can still die (21.569). Agenor's assertion of Achilles' mortality confirms not just the many prophecies of Achilles' death that have occurred since his decision to avenge Patroklos, but also play on Achilles' vulnerability in his encounter with the river Xanthos just a few scenes ago. So Agenor stands his ground, challenging Achilles. Here he claims that Achilles must have wanted to sack Troy today, but Agenor says, there are many fighting men inside the walls of Troy 'who will stand before our dear parents and our wives and our sons to defend Ilion' (οἷ καὶ πρόσθε φίλων τοκέων ἀλόχων τε καὶ υἰῶν/ Ἴλιον εἰρυνόμεσθα, 21.587f.): this obliquely looks forward to Hektor's stand against Achilles, guarding his parents, his wife, and his son, all inside the city. Then Agenor tell Achilles that 'here' he will find his fate (ἐνθάδε, 21.588): ironic because it is true of Troy, but not of *now*. Apollo must step in and rescue Agenor from Achilles' charge, the third in a pattern started in Book 20, where the only men to escape Achilles must be rescued directly by the gods (Poseidon rescues Aineias at 20.321–39; Apollo rescues Hektor at 20.443–54). Now the audience aligns with Apollo as he disguises himself as Agenor and leads Achilles off on a chase away from the city as the Trojans flee into their town (21.600–11). The Trojans arrive safely inside Troy's walls, as the Achaians set up close to their battlements (22.1–4). Only Hektor remains outside the walls, where 'his own deadly fate shackled him to stay' (αὐτοῦ μείναι ὀλοῖη μοῖρα πέδησεν, 22.5); this

plays on previous spoilers of Hektor's fate (cf. 15.68, 17.206–8), and prepares the audience for what must be the final, deadly confrontation between Hektor and Achilles (cf. 18.114f.; 18.333–5, etc.).

Achilles: 22.7–24

The narrative switches audience alignment away from Hektor, stuck by the Skaian gates, back to Apollo and Achilles (22.7). The narrator makes no indication that Apollo is disguised as Agenor here (as it reiterated at 21.600–2), nor is Agenor mentioned in the exchange between Apollo and Achilles that follows. This omission would make their exchange harder to follow if the performer took a break between Books 21 and 22, suggesting after 21.525 as a stronger choice for a break, as Agenor's name would have been mentioned only a minute or two before without a break. Here, Apollo rebukes Achilles' futile chase (22.7–13), and the scene calls back to Apollo's rebuke for Hektor as he chased Achilles' horses (17.71–81). This creates a parallel between the two that augments the anticipation for their encounter. Achilles rebukes Apollo right back for stealing his glory, but then runs back towards Troy (22.14–24).

Cheap seats: 22.25–89

With Hektor fixed by deadly fate outside the walls (22.5), and Achilles heading back fast towards Troy (22.21–4), the narrator further readies the audience for their confrontation. The narrative has always worked towards its inevitable showdown between Achilles and Hektor: Achilles had painted Hektor as a primary enemy as far back as his quarrel with Agamemnon (1.242f.), had said that he would fight Hektor around his own ship (9.650–5), has said again and again since Patroklos's death that he would kill the Trojan leader in revenge (18.90–3; 18.114f.; 18.334f.). Hektor, too, has often spoken of being ready for combat with Achilles, returning and returned (16.860f., 18.305–9; 20.366–72; 20.435–7). Yet despite this focus on and between the two antagonists, the narrative continues to use its melodramatic alignment structure leading into, through, and out of their dramatic encounter to heighten the audience affect of a contest everyone now knows will end in Hektor's death.

For the second time, the narrative aligns the audience with Priam, who sees Achilles approach Troy (22.25, cf. 21.527). The narrative sandwiches an extended

simile of Achilles' brightness in his armour like the Plague Star between Priam's perception of and response to his approach (22.25–34), amplifying its alignment with Priam during Achilles' approach. The narrative also describes Priam's response with sound and gesture, making it particularly memorable to the audience as he groans aloud, beats his head with his raised hands, and groans again, and stretches out his arms (22.33–7): these are ritual gestures of mourning, so that again, Hektor is mourned before he dies.¹¹¹ This is how Priam, from his place high on the wall, supplicates his son, stood all alone outside the great Trojan defences, eager to fight with Achilles (ἄμοτον μεμαῶς Ἀχιλῆϊ μάχεσθαι, 22.36, cf. 13.40, 13.80).

Priam's supplication spells out the risk to Hektor: 'you might soon be beaten down by Peleus's son, since he is far stronger' (μη τάχα πότμον ἐπίσπησ/Πηλεΐωνι δαμείς, ἐπεὶ ἢ πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστι, 22.39f.), recapping Hektor's own assessment of his comparative weakness at 20.434–7 (cf. 21.566; 20.334). Then Priam gives his own backstory with Achilles as an explanation of his present concern. This deepens both characters and their relationship to each other while also playing on audience memory, both within the epic and within tradition. Priam says that Achilles has killed many of his sons, and sold others off (22.44f.). This invites the audience to try to remember which of Priam's sons they have seen Achilles kill; the invitation becomes more specific when Priam mentions Lykaon and Polydoros (21.91), whom he cannot see, but whom he will ransom if they are still alive, and grieve if they are dead (22.46–53). Priam's ignorance plays on the audience's knowledge: they, along with Hektor, saw Achilles eviscerate Polydoros (20.407–19), just as they saw Achilles stab Lykaon (aware of Polydoros's death; 21.85–93) and leave his body to the fishes (21.115–27). Priam's own statement that the people will mourn more for Hektor than they would for Polydoros and Lykaon particularly creates *pathos*, as the audience has already experienced those losses and now have Hektor's to look forward to. Then Priam tries to convince Hektor to come inside by reiterating his role as the defender of Troy's women and children (22.56f.). Finally, Priam asks Hektor to pity him, giving him a glimpse of the future that will come from Hektor's death. These details are terrible on their own, but they also play on the traditional audience's knowledge, as the things that Priam envisages do happen (22.59–71):¹¹² Priam will lose still more sons (like Paris); his daughters will be dragged away (like Cassandra); the innocent child thrown from the wall will be his own grandson, Hektor's son, Astyanax;¹¹³ his daughters-in-law will be dragged away (like Andromache). And Priam, too, will die, his corpse ripped apart by his own dogs.¹¹⁴ Priam ends his speech again pulling at his grey hairs, but the narrative re-aligns the audience with Hektor, whom Priam has not convinced.

Hekabe stands besides Priam, and the narrative marks out her presence too, beyond identification, as she weeps and makes the memorable gesture of exposing her breasts to her son beneath the wall (22.79–81).¹¹⁵ Hekabe's speech also references the past and fears the future as she tries to convince her son. Hekabe speaks to their personal past as she refers to her breasts that fed the infant Hektor (22.82f.). Then Hekabe shifts to the possible future beyond Hektor's death, where she sets the possibility in the audience's mind that she and Andromache will not be able to mourn Hektor's corpse, because the 'fast dogs will feed' on him (κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται, 22.89).

The narrative aligns the audience with Hektor's parents watching him from high on the wall, giving access to their emotions around Hektor's confrontation with Achilles as a cue for the audience's own. At the same time, their speeches place that confrontation within the history of the storyworld and its characters, inviting the audience to consider the events that preceded it and what will come of it, not just in the *Iliad's* narrative, but beyond.

Hektor: 22.90–130

The narrative finally switches the audience's alignment to Hektor himself, described as a snake waiting in a hole as he waits for Achilles (22.93–5). Hektor's long monologue, his longest in the epic, gives the audience plenty of access to his character as he tries to decide what to do as Achilles bears down on him. The speech is a clear callback to Agenor's own (21.553–70), just at the beginning of this episode (if the performer takes a break after 21.525). Hektor's speech also recaps previous episodes and gives his character more depth, inviting allegiance through his consideration of possible actions.

Hektor's speech first recaps and reframes Poulydamas' advice (22.100–2 refers to 18.254–309): now, two and half hours later, Hektor regrets refusing to bring the Trojans back into the city as Poulydamas had suggested, and he says that he would feel ashamed to have to face Poulydamas if he went back into Troy,¹¹⁶ ashamed that any worse man might say that he destroyed his people (22.106–8).¹¹⁷ Like Achilles, Hektor learns too late about the consequences of an earlier action, and expresses regret; so the character acknowledges their own seemingly continuous experience, complete with ordered and consequential events.¹¹⁸ Not only does this make the character feel more 'real', but because the audience has experienced those same events, they feel closer to the character in remembering them. With this regret, Hektor

eliminates the option of his going back inside Troy: even dying at Achilles' hands would be better (22.108–10).

Next he considers laying down his arms to meet Achilles and to offer Helen, along with all her possessions and even all the Trojan possessions, back to the Atreides (22.111–21); this recaps the cause of the war, and also calls back to the Trojan assembly's decision *not* to return Helen and her things, many hours ago (7.345–64). Each of these options that Hektor considers creates a possibility for allegiance, as the audience might support an option that Hektor dismisses, just as they might support his dismissal of all of them. The fact that both of his parents urge him to return to the city in the beats just before this speech also affects our allegiance. Personally, I wish that Hektor would suck up his shame and get inside the city (I cannot say how much influence Priam and Hekabe have had on me). But there is a particularly painful pleasure in knowing that Hektor will not return to Troy.

In his deliberations, Hektor also looks longingly back to a past, but a past that perhaps never existed: 'now there's no way, from under some tree or rock for us two to talk gently, like a young woman and a young man, like a young woman and a young man talk gently to each other' (οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης/ τῷ ὀαριζέμεναι, ἅ τε παρθένος ἠῖθεός τε/ παρθένος ἠῖθεός τ' ὀαριζετον ἀλλήλουιν. 22.126–8). Does this obliquely refer to the past where Achilles took men alive in orchards (21.33–41)? Is it simply a romantic vision that is as out of place as Hektor's hope of survival? Does it speak to Hektor really wishing that he still lingered where last he talked gently with Andromache (cf. ὀαριζετον at 6.516)? Perhaps it is an oblique reference to battle, a callback to Hektor's referring to the 'gentle discourse' of battle (ὀαριστύς at 17.228).¹¹⁹ Finally Hektor says that he will stand and fight, and 'we'll see to which one the Olympian grants the glory' (εἶδομεν ὀπποτέρῳ κεν Ὀλύμπιος εὖχος ὀρέξῃ, 22.130; cf. 18.309; 20.435–7). This builds further audience anticipation for the fight to come.

The great escape: 22.131–66

But Hektor's last words are misleading: more still will happen before the actual fight between Hektor and Achilles. The narrative cuts back to Achilles' approach, likening him to the war god, his armour shining like the sun (22.131–5). Then the narrative switches audience alignment back to Hektor, giving access to his emotional response to Achilles' approach as the tremors take him and he runs ('Ἐκτορα δ', ὡς ἐνόησεν, ἔλε τρόμος, 22.136). For all his contemplation, Hektor's

instincts get the better of him. The narrative takes its time on the chase – working backwards across the plain just as it followed Achilles over ground as he killed. The narrative follows Achilles and Hektor past the springs of Skamandrios, the river that played such an important part in the previous episode (22.149). The springs send the narrative further back in time, when the Trojan women would do their laundry there, before the Achaians came (22.153–6).¹²⁰ Like Hektor’s fantasy of young love, this image presents a window onto another world, or at least onto another storyworld that contrasts with the one that Achilles and Hektor run through. The narrative keeps constructing that contrast with the following similes – they run like they are in a race, but the prize is Hektor’s life (22.158–61).

Gods: 22.166–247

Finally, the narrative switches scenes to the gods, aligning the audience with them as they watch the chase from above. Now Zeus, too, looks at Hektor and reflects on their shared backstory that justifies Zeus’s present emotional response to his situation: Zeus’s heart mourns for Hektor because Hektor was devoted to him (22.168–72). And Zeus, too, thinks of that past in contrast to this present, where he recaps the previous scene: Achilles chases Hektor around the city of Priam (22.172f.). Zeus considers saving him, but Athena reminds him that not all the gods will be happy about it if he does (22.174–81), in a conversation that calls back to Zeus wanting to save his son Sarpedon and Hera’s negative response (16.431–61), and reinforces the gods’ care for mortal men. But they are just mortal men (cf. 21.463–7). Zeus gives Athena the go ahead to do what she will (22.185), setting her role in the scenes to come, calling back to Patroklos’s prophecy that she, too, will kill Hektor (16.852–4).

The narrative switches audience alignment back to Achilles chasing Hektor, which the narrative continues to displace with other images that extend the scene and add to the sense of the chase: a deer and a fawn, men running in a dream (22.188–201). The narrator asks the terrible question: ‘How could Hektor have escaped the spirits of death, if Apollo hadn’t come to him, one last, final time and stirred up his strength and his fast knees?’ (πῶς δέ κεν Ἔκτωρ κῆρας ὑπεξέφυγεν θανάτοιο,/ εἰ μή οἱ πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἦν τετ’ Ἀπόλλων/ ἐγγύθεν, ὅς οἱ ἐπῶρσε μένος λαιψηρά τε γοῦνα; 22.204–6) The narrative emphasizes the extensive relationship between Apollo and Hektor that the audience has watched unfold over the last several episodes. It was Apollo who

helped Hektor when Aias hit him with the rock and he almost died (15.239–62), Apollo who saved him when Achilles would have surely killed him the last time they met (20.440–6). But this, the narrative tells us, is the last time.

After a brief cut away to Achilles, shaking his head at his men not to fire at Hektor (22.205–7), delaying that death just a little longer, the narrative switches scenes again back to Zeus. This time, he holds the scales of fate (callback to 8.69, 12.433), and Hektor's death-day sinks, and Apollo abandons him (22.208–13).

The narrative switches audience alignment to Athena, creating character continuity from her leaving Zeus's side to her now arriving at Achilles' side (22.186f.; 22.215). She assures Achilles before appearing to Hektor as his brother Deiphobos, tricking him to stop running because 'he' will help him, and together they might kill Achilles (22.214–47). This terrible trick exploits the epic's melodramatic alignment structure, because the audience watches it unfold, aware of the deception the whole time, while Hektor is blissfully unaware.

Hektor versus Achilles: 22.247–369

With Athena's plan set in motion, the narrative zooms out to show both men charging towards one another, and Hektor speaks first (22.247–9). Hektor's speech diegetically retells the last few beats from his perspective to contrast his previous behaviour with how he wants to behave now. Before, he ran, three times round the city (22.250–3 recaps 22.136–238), now, he will not (*vũv*, 22.252).

Hektor then proposes to Achilles that he will not defile Achilles' corpse should he kill him, and asks Achilles to do the same (22.254–9). Hektor's offer of the honour of burial to his enemy calls back to his single combat proposal at 7.76–91 – even while that sequence took place over twelve hours ago with breaks, the situation is parallel enough that it would trigger audience memory of Hektor's behaviour within such a situation.¹²¹ In anticipating Achilles' response, the audience might remember Andromache telling Hektor that Achilles, once he killed her father, Eëtion, burnt his body in all his armour as a sign of respect (6.416–20). But this Achilles is different, now – no longer minded to spare the Trojans, he said, when he killed the suppliant Lykaon (21.100–2). He left the bodies of Lykaon and Asteropaios as feasts for the fishes (21.120–35; 21.200–4), countless other corpses to clog Xanthos's stream or be burnt up by Hephaistos's terrible flames.

Achilles brutally rejects Hektor's offer, but his rejection creates a curious response to Hektor's own fantasy of possible love between the two men (the

‘gentle talking,’ cf. 22.127f.), as Achilles says, ‘it’s not possible for you and me to be friends’ (ὥς οὐκ ἔστ’ ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ φιλήμεναι, 22.265). Its impossibility considers the possibility before dismissing it: like flash sideways, these last few beats continuously refer to a parallel world where these two men *could* be friends, where the Trojan women happily gather outside the city walls to do their weekly washes (cf. 22.153–7). These suggestions, subtle as they might be, make their refusal all the sharper, and that much harder to bear.

Achilles ends his speech with an emphasis on this present, where Hektor’s fate is sealed: ‘There’s no more escape for you, since Pallas Athena will beat you down with my spear; now you’ll pay for all the thronging sorrows of my companions, whom you killed, raging with your spear.’ (οὐ τοι ἔτ’ ἔσθ’ ὑπάλυξις, ἄφαρ δέ σε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη/ ἔγχει ἐμῶ δαμάα· νῦν δ’ ἄθροα πάντ’ ἀποτίσεις/ κήδε’ ἐμῶν ἐτάρων οὐς ἔκτανες ἔγχεϊ θύων. 22.270–2; cf. 16.852–4, 18.92f.) With that, Achilles makes his first cast.

Despite the expectations that his speech sets for the audience, Achilles misses as Hektor dodges his spear (22.273–6). The narrative aligns the audience with Athena as she picks up the spear and gives it straight back to Achilles, ‘unnoticed by Hektor’ (22.277): this calls back to Athena’s intervention in the last face off between Achilles and Hektor, where she blew Hektor’s spear away from Achilles (20.438–41). Here, with Achilles back in possession of his spear, the narrator again has a secret that he shares with his audience, but not with Hektor, and like so many other things that the audience knows but he does not, it makes this harder. Hektor’s speech to Achilles immediately draws out this gap between his knowledge and the audience’s own:¹²² he assumes that Achilles missing might mean that Achilles does not actually know that he will kill Hektor (22.279–82 recaps 22.270–2). But Hektor says that he will not be afraid, even if Achilles has tried to scare him: looking forward, he says that he will take a spear straight in the chest as he charges, if he is going to die (22.283–6). Hektor ends his response with the consequences of Achilles’ death for the Trojans as a whole, reinforcing even in this late hour his role as Trojan leader and protector: ‘the war will be much easier for the Trojans if you’re dead. Cause you’re their greatest pain.’ (καὶ κεν ἐλαφρότερος πόλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο/ σείο καταφθιμένοιο· σὺ γάρ σφισι πῆμα μέγιστον, 22.287f.)

Hektor makes his throw, bounces it off Achilles’ shield, gets upset, looks for Deïphobos and realizes that he is alone (22.289–96), where the narrative gives the audience access to his recognition:¹²³ ‘And Hektor knew in his thoughts. . .’ (Ἐκτωρ δ’ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ, 22.296) Hektor’s speech that follows confirms his recognition and recaps Athena’s deception (22.297–9 recaps 22.226–47).

Now Hektor, too, knows that his own death stands close to him, closing the gap between his knowledge, that of other characters (cf. Zeus at 17.201f.; Thetis at 28.133) and the audience's own. But, even after this recognition, Hektor says: 'I'm not going to die without a fight, without glory, but I'll die doing something great that the future will hear about' (μη μὲν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην/ ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, 22.304f.). So Hektor knows he will die but charges anyways (cf. Aias at 16.362f.; Hektor at 20.435–8). Here the narrative gives the audience access to Hektor's motivations: he hopes to win glory (cf. 6.444–6). This stands in addition to what the access that Hektor's last speech gave the audience, where he said that Achilles is the Trojans' greatest pain (22.288f.), giving further reason for Hektor to want to at least try to kill him.

The narrator signals Hektor's charge through a masterfully subtle subterfuge of a simile, allowing Hektor, for the first time in this long encounter, to become the predator (here, a hawk), while Achilles seemingly becomes the prey: a weak lamb or a cowering hare (22.306–11). This inverts the first simile of their long chase, where Achilles was a hawk and Hektor, a shivering dove (22.139–42). But in painting Achilles as a possible victim here, the narrative plays on the frequent narrative references to Achilles' death following on from Hektor's: if the audience does not know how Achilles dies, then they might think that this is it. Even if they do know, there might be a moment's hesitation, of hope or incredulity that asks 'is this it?'

But then the narrative switches audience alignment to Achilles, crouching, eyeing Hektor up – with his beautiful skin – until Achilles sees that one vulnerable place in his armour, *his* armour, where he can thrust his spear (22.311–25). And within that description, the narrative deliberately describes the armour 'that (Hektor) stripped from Patroklos, after he cut down his lifeforce' (τὰ Πατρόκλοιο βίην ἐνάριξε κατακτάς, 22.323). This narrative recap affects audience allegiance for the action that follows it, a possible justification as Achilles thrusts his spear through Hektor's neck, just above the collarbone (22.321–7).

Hektor falls, windpipe intact so that the men might have one last exchange. Achilles speaks first, and he recaps Hektor's killing Patroklos (22.331 recaps 16.818–57), assumes what Hektor thought at that time (22.331f. elaborates on 16.836f.), recaps his own being by the ships, and then looks forward, to the birds and the dogs that will tear at Hektor's body, and the burial that Patroklos's corpse will receive (22.335f.). The dying Hektor begs Achilles not to leave his body to the dogs, to accept the ransom that his family will give for him, so that the Trojans might give him his funeral pyre (22.338–43), repeating his concern for his corpse that he expressed when he first encountered Achilles at 22.254–9.

Achilles emphatically refuses (22.344–54). Hektor's final speech (22.356–60), like Patroklos's before it (16.843–54), acts as a prophecy for the future where Apollo and Paris kill Achilles. But that is a future that will not come, not in this story.¹²⁴ Hektor's death is the same as Patroklos's (22.361–3 = 16.855–7), too, but Achilles' response to the prophecy is different than Hektor's, more like Hektor's speech to Andromache than his refutation of Patroklos, or Achilles' own refusal of the horse Xanthos's prophecy: 'I will die whenever the gods want me to' (22.365f.; cf. 6.485–7, 19.420–3). Achilles pulls his spear from Hektor's corpse and strips the body (22.367–9).

As with Patroklos's death, Hektor's death sets off a series of internal emotional responses, where the narrative exploits its melodramatic alignment structure. The narrative builds on each character response towards an extraordinary response by a character closest to the dead: in Patroklos's case, that response was Achilles'; for Hektor, it will be Andromache's. But first, the other Achaians, then Achilles, then Priam, then Hekabe, and finally, Andromache, in a chain of emotional responses to Hektor's death that compares to those responses to Patroklos's death, but are much condensed.

Bodies: 22.369–404

When Achilles has pulled his spear out of Hektor's body, the narrative switches the audience's alignment to the other Achaians, who have literally been sidelined throughout this episode, mentioned only twice in passing (22.3f.; 22.205–8). Now they look on Hektor's admirable form (εἶδος ἀγῆτον, 22.370); a callback to the previous beat, where Achilles eyed up Hektor's lovely skin (χρῶα καλόν, 22.321). Now they each stab him, and say to each other: 'Hektor's so much softer to the touch now, than when he set the ships on fire' (ἦ μάλα δὴ μαλακώτερος ἀμφαφάασθαι/ Ἔκτωρ ἦ ὅτε νῆας ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέω, 22.374f.). So they recap one of Hektor's great moments of glory, around five hours ago in performance time, without breaks (16.114–24), as a stark contrast to their stabbing his naked corpse now (22.376). The narrative relies on the audience's shared memory of Hektor's setting fire to the ships to recognize that difference all the more.

The narrative switches back to Achilles, who addresses the men. Achilles starts by asking what they should do now, now that he has killed Hektor. Achilles defines Hektor as having 'done many bad things, more than all the rest' (ὄς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρρεξεν ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι, 22.380), which puts him in agreement

with other Achaian-allied assessments of Hektor (cf. Hera at 8.352–6; Agamemnon at 10.47–52). Such statements invite the audience to compare their own experience of Hektor against these evaluations, to remember what ‘bad things’ they might have seen Hektor do. The narrative stays with Achilles as he wonders if the Trojans will still fight without Hektor (22.381–4), and then his thoughts turn to Patroklos, still unburied besides the ships (22.385–90). This flip, away from the corpse *here* to the corpse *there* connects the two as cause and effect, justifying one with the other, just as the narrative did by recapping Hektor’s killing Patroklos just before Achilles kills Hektor (22.321–8). Achilles cannot forget Patroklos (22.387–90), and he does not let us forget him, either. With Patroklos in mind, Achilles once more boasts that he has killed Hektor, whom the Trojans prayed to like a god (ὃ Τρῶες κατὰ ἄστυ θεῶ ὡς εὐχετόωντο, 22.394).¹²⁵ And with Patroklos in mind, the audience remains aligned with Achilles when he straps the corpse of Hektor, naked, to his chariot (22.395–400). Then, painfully, the narrative switches audience alignment again to Hektor: the dust-cloud around Hektor’s dragged corpse; his dark hair falling; his head, beautiful before, laid in the dust (22.401–5).

Bad news travels fast: 22.405–36

The narrative switches scenes by repeating the state of Hektor’s head before following Hekabe’s gaze back to the wall, where she sees her son’s naked body dragged (22.405). Hekabe responds again in memorable, ritual gestures:¹²⁶ she tears out her hair and throws off her veil as Priam groans, and everyone else begins to lament (22.407–9). Then the narrator compares this response to Hektor’s death to how they might respond to the fall of Troy itself: ‘It was like what would happen if all of Troy had burned from the top down.’ (τῶ δὲ μάλιστ’ ἄρ’ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον ὡς εἰ ἅπασα/Ἰλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ’ ἄκρης. 22.410f.) This connects Hektor’s death with the fall of Troy, as Hektor himself did in his conversation with Andromache at 6.447–65.¹²⁷ At the same time, in a strong nod to tradition, the narrative gets a chance to show how it *would* represent that lamentation, if the sack of Troy *were* in this story.¹²⁸

The narrative aligns the audience next with Priam, who rolls in the muck and begs his men to let him leave the city to supplicate Achilles to ransom Hektor’s corpse (22.413–29). At the end of his speech, he speaks of how he wishes that Hektor had died in his arms (22.426–8): this narrative access to Priam recalls and contrasts Hektor’s actual death (22.326–63).

From Priam, the narrative switches audience alignment back to Hekabe, as she leads the Trojan women's lament. Her speech gives further backstory to Hektor, who was Hekabe's glory, a help to all the Trojans (22.432–4), who accepted him like a god (οἶσε θεὸν ὦς/ δειδέχασ', 22.434f.; cf. 13.53–5). Hekabe's view of the Trojans' relationship to Hektor reinforces Achilles' own, just a few minutes earlier in the previous beat (22.394). These repeated judgements that others layer on Hektor impose on audience experience of him and start to reshape allegiance to his character. This kind of narrative manipulation of the impressions of a character, built between the audience's and other character's experiences of that character, has been going on all along, but with the death of a character, it necessarily changes. Now the audience will have no new character information from Hektor himself, no new experiences of Hektor that they will share with those other characters in the text. Now, any statements made about Hektor can only be compared to the audience's memories of him, not to an on-going experience of him.

Bad new travels slow: 22.437–515

The narrative finally switches to Andromache, identifying her through her role as Hektor's wife, who, the narrator says, did not *know*, because no messenger had told her 'how her husband had stayed outside the gates' (ὅττι ῥά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πυλάων, 22.439). It is a strange synecdoche of the whole death-scene which does not mention his death itself, instead recapping 22.5f.; and this recap is not for Andromache, but for the audience. The narrative then takes its time describing Andromache in her room, weaving, getting the servants to run Hektor a bath. The narrator plays with time in order to disrupt this domestic tableau:¹²⁹ the lamentation on the walls started a couple of minutes of performance time ago (22.408f.), but Andromache still has not heard the din.¹³⁰ The narrative tells the audience again of her ignorance, this time explicitly recapping what had happened to Hektor: 'Innocent, she didn't yet know that far from the baths grey-eyed Athena had beat him down at the hands of Achilles.' (νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν ὃ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν/ χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη. 22.445f. recaps 22.289–363)¹³¹ So the narrator allows the audience to see her response, even if it means that he must move back in time, taking a moment before he bursts the bubble of Andromache's blissfully ignorant domestic life. The lamentations from the wall literally break in – the first word in the line with its voiceless velar stop, *kōkutou*, cutting in, the lamentations 'she heard, and the

groans from the battlement' (κωκυτοῦ δ' ἤκουσε καὶ οἰωγῆς ἀπὸ πύργου, 22.447; cf. 22.409).¹³² I have always thought her response, so imagistic, would show in slow motion: her limbs begin to tremble, her shuttle drops from her hand to the floor as she wheels round (22.447–9). She still does not really *know*: she suspects, and Andromache calls out to her handmaidens to tell her what happened.

In her questioning speech, Andromache recaps what happened, without knowing what has happened. She fears that Achilles might have cut Hektor off from the city and chased him into the plain, since Hektor's courage would always compel him to fight out in front and not to yield (22.455–9): this is precisely what happened, recapping Hektor's decision to take a stand *and* his flight (22.5–213). Maybe, she says, Achilles 'will stop his awful manliness', recalling her statement to Hektor that his *menos* would kill him (6.407). This, too, is what has happened. But she does not *know* it. Not yet.

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Andromache as she runs from her room like a madwoman (22.460f.). Maintaining this alignment exploits the *Iliad's* melodramatic structure, and allows for a second 'recognition', as the audience knows that Andromache will soon see what the others have seen from the Trojan wall (Hekabe at 22.407), what they themselves have seen (22.396–404), creating Achilles dragging Hektor as a continuous and continuing action. And now Andromache finally sees him, dragged (τὸν δὲ νόησεν/ ἔλκόμενον, 22.463f.). Then the narrative shows Andromache's response, as she faints, darkness covering her eyes,¹³³ her diadem tumbling backwards as she falls (22.465–8). The narrative gives the diadem a backstory, as it was given to Andromache on her wedding day (22.467–72):¹³⁴ this deepens her reaction, makes it more than just this moment, makes it a whole life now fallen away.

As Andromache comes to, she reinforces how this present that the audience now experiences, where Hektor is dead, contrasts with the past they have only glimpsed and a future they might not know. Andromache makes these contrasts clear when she speaks of the 'before' (πρὶν μὲν, 22.500) ... 'but now' (νῦν δ', 22.505) of Astyanax's fortunes. Her vision of Astyanax's life is wretched, but not as bad as his death will actually be, and that irony would play with a traditional audience.¹³⁵ But everything about Astyanax is linked to Hektor. In Book 6, when the narrative introduced Astyanax in his only scene, it explained that the Trojan people called him that because 'Hektor alone defended Troy' (οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτωρ, 6.403). Now Andromache repeats and elaborates on the origins of Astyanax's name, addressing the dead, dragged Hektor, saying that 'you alone defended the gates and the great walls' (οἷος γὰρ σφιν ἔρυσσεν πύλας καὶ τείχεα

μακρά. 22.507). Andromache then creates another contrast with this past Hektor and the Hektor that she sees now, who will be the feast of dogs and worms (22.508–10), even while good clothes await him at home, a callback to the domestic scene where the narrative found her at 22.440.

This chain of emotional responses from Hektor's death, from the other Achaians on the battlefield, Achilles himself, Priam and Hekabe, and finally Andromache, works to amplify and affect audience response mirroring, as it does, a kind of 'scale of affection'.¹³⁶ Without these endless refractions, without these visions of the past with Hektor and the future without Hektor, his death would not seem the same. By the time Andromache has finished her speech, and the women join in with her lamentations, Hektor is no longer Hektor, no longer the same Hektor that we have experienced throughout the *Iliad* so far. In death, he exists solely at the intersections of other character's memories of him, and the narrator's, and our own.

Achaians: 23.1–257

The narrative switches scenes away from Troy, back to the Achaian camp, at the beginning of Book 23. This switch feels like a clean performance break, and Achilles' interactions with his men, Patroklos's corpse, and Hektor's own corpse provide ample opportunity to recap the previous episode. Book 23 makes few mentions of Hektor, though of course he does appear in the abuse that Achilles deals out to his corpse and in the accomplishment of Achilles' past promises to Patroklos. But Book 23 really serves as a final closure to the Achaian storylines, with its total resolution between Achilles and Agamemnon and its many curtain calls for the main Achaian heroes: only Achilles will appear after Book 23.

The scene switches away from Andromache and the women's lamentations back to Achilles and the Achaians, and this beat juxtaposition creates its own meaning: 'so they mourned throughout the city' (23.1). These parallels, this death followed by this mourning, like Achilles' own distraction from *this* corpse here (Hektor) to *that* corpse there (Patroklos), like the repetition of their death lines, conflate the deaths and mourning associated with Patroklos and with Hektor.

The Achaians return to their camps, and the narrative aligns the audience with Achilles and the Myrmidons as they remain gathered together mourning Patroklos at Achilles' command (23.1–11). The narrative gives the audience access to the Achaians as the men long for Patroklos (23.16, cf. Menelaos 17.690),

a man who was an ‘author of fear’ (23.16): their assessment calls back to Patroklos’s fighting in Book 16, and stands in contrast with other post-mortem thoughts of Patroklos focused on his gentleness (17.669–72; 19.300). Then Achilles recaps his previous promises to Patroklos’s corpse (23.19–23 recaps 18.334–7), when he claims that he will leave Hektor’s body to the dogs and sacrifice the twelve young Trojans (captured at 21.27f.). In fact, he had promised Patroklos Hektor’s armour and head (18.334f.). This subtle change opens up the possibility that Hektor’s body will remain intact, and attentive or traditional audiences would pick up on this clue. Then Achilles lays Hektor’s corpse face down in the dust next to Patroklos’s bier (23.24–6), recalling his head being dragged in the dust in the previous episode (22.401–3). Once the Achaians have eaten and Achilles has ordered Agamemnon that Patroklos should be burned at dawn (22.35–61), Achilles finally falls asleep on the beach. Here the narrative recaps his chasing Hektor, and says that the chase has worn Achilles out (23.63f. recaps 22.136–232).

While Achilles sleeps, Patroklos’s ghost visits him. The ghost’s speech adds further depth to both characters, as Patroklos asks that their bones be buried together, and gives the backstory of how Peleus took him in as a murderer-exile, to be Achilles’ attendant (23.82–92). This is another wonderful moment that looks both backwards and forwards, *beyond* the *Iliad* in both directions. For the audience, this deepens the past relationship of Achilles and Patroklos, showing us a past where they were together, as much as it continues to build anticipation for Achilles’ own death, and a future where his bones will lay with Patroklos’s own: a future where the men are together again.

When Achilles awakes from his dream, he recaps the previous beat of Patroklos’s ghost’s visit, saying that it told him all that he should do (23.103–8 recaps 23.69–92). They set the sacrifices on the pyre, with jars of honey and four horses; Achilles kills two of Patroklos’s nine dogs, and adds them to the pyre, before finally killing the twelve Trojans (23.175–7; cf. 21.27f.; 18.334–7). When Achilles addresses Patroklos on the pyre, he reinforces what he said earlier in the episode about Hektor’s corpse: ‘But as for Hektor, I won’t give the son of Priam to the fire to devour, but to the dogs.’ (Ἐκτορα δ’ οὐ τι/δώσω Πριαμίδην πυρὶ δαπτέμεν, ἀλὰ κύνεσιν, 23.182f.) So for the second time in about twelve minutes of performance, Achilles alters the terms of his vengeance-promise to Patroklos, leaving Hektor’s body, for now, intact (18.334f.). The narrative then elaborates on Hektor’s body *staying* intact, as it instantly contradicts Achilles’ speech, saying that the dogs will not get at Hektor’s body, which Aphrodite and Apollo protect (23.184–91).¹³⁷

Games: 23.257–897

The narrative will not mention Hektor again in the remaining thirty-five to forty minutes of the funeral games' beat sequence. The funeral games importantly include, just as the god-fight in Book 21 had for the gods, curtain calls for most of the main Achaian characters.¹³⁸ Not only do they get final moments of action, but we will see how several of these beats callback to earlier episodes, allowing the audience to reflect on their experience of these characters as a whole, over a long period of time.

The chariot race is first, and its main competitors are Eumelos (in his first appearance since the catalogue of ships), Diomedes (on Aineias's horses), Menelaos, Antilochos, and Meriones, with Phoinix as judge (23.288–361). Diomedes' entry into the race recaps his capturing of Aineias's horses and Apollo's rescuing Aineias (23.290–2), which actually conflates two different beats from Book 5, both of which took place almost fourteen hours ago in performance time without breaks: Aphrodite saving Aineias as his horses are captured (5.305–27) and Apollo saving Aineias (5.443–518). Both of these happened within Diomedes' *aristeia*, and would remind an audience of his high point in the epic, fitting before his curtain call.

The narrative switches audience alignment to Nestor, who gives an extended speech to his son Antilochos to advise him before the race: just the fact that he gives such a long speech gives him a recognizable character moment.¹³⁹ During the race itself, Athena supports Diomedes, in another callback to her support of his *aristeia* in Book 5. Eumelos, the least known hero of those presented here, now serves as a kind of non-lethal red-shirt, wiping out with his chariot when Athena breaks his chariot's yoke (23.391–7). Following Diomedes in second and third place, Menelaos and Antilochos get into an altercation when Antilochos tries to push both of them to take their chariots through a narrow pass: Menelaos intentionally slows his horses down to prevent a crash, saying that he will lodge a protest (23.417–45). Menelaos remains a 'nice guy'. The narrative switches scenes by aligning the audience with Idomeneus, watching the race, who immediately recognizes Diomedes in front (23.448–55) and whose speech to the other Achaians gives him a chance to report this fact and recap that someone's (Eumelos's) horses have fouled (23.457–72). Oilean Aias challenges him on Diomedes' being in the lead, which Idomeneus takes up, and so even here in the funeral games, the narrative exploits its melodramatic alignment structure, as the audience *knows* that Diomedes is in first, as Idomeneus suggests, and so knows that Aias will lose his challenge (23.473–89). But Achilles puts an end to

the challenge, saying that they will all see who wins – at that moment Diomedes pulls up, in a wonder of constructed continuity, so that these characters and the audience all do see Diomedes win together (23.499–513).

Achilles' stopping Oïlean Aias and Idomeneus from arguing is the first of many positive conflict resolutions that the games present, all of which stand in contrast to the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon that set everything in motion. The others finish the chariot race: Antilochos, then Menelaos, then Meriones, and finally Eumelos (23.513–33). The narrative switches audience alignment to Achilles, who sees Eumelos and pities him and wants to offer him second place, while Diomedes will take first (23.534–8). Antilochos erupts at this, describes Eumelos's fouled horses (23.545–7 recapping 23.391–7), and demands his second place prize, and that Eumelos should get something else from Achilles' own things (23.543–54). This entirely mirrors the situation between Achilles and Agamemnon from the beginning of the epic, where Agamemnon took something away that he had promised.¹⁴⁰ But Achilles immediately accedes to Antilochos, and gives Eumelos a separate prize (23.555–9). Asteropaios's corselet serves as this prize, and as a reminder of Achilles' killing Asteropaios, around eighty minutes of performance time ago (23.560–2 recalls 21.179–83).

Menelaos too now complains about Antilochos's actions in the race, and calls for him to take an oath that he did not cheat (23.566–85):¹⁴¹ but as between Achilles and Antilochos, Antilochos, too, makes it up to Menelaos, offering him the second prize of a mare (23.586–95). Antilochos so moves Menelaos, and the narrator takes one more chance to use an apostrophe with Menelaos to introduce his last speech in the epic, where he makes up with Antilochos and gives him back the mare (23.596–611): 'So, Menelaos, your heart softened' (ὥς ἄρα σοὶ Μενέλαε μετὰ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη. 23.600). This last special alignment with Menelaos as he makes it up with Antilochos serves as a fitting curtain call for his character.

Achilles then gives another prize to Nestor, 'as a souvenir of Patroklos's funeral' (Πατρόκλοιο τάφου μνήμη, 23.619), reminding everyone of the reason for the games, and of Nestor being too old to compete, which reinforces his character image (23.616–23). Nestor's long response serves both functions as well, speaking of his past glories in games gone by, before closing on Patroklos' memory (23.624–50): even Nestor's thanking Achilles for remembering Nestor's kindness reminds us of Patroklos, as that word (ἐνηέος, 23.648), has only ever been used to describe Patroklos in the epic (17.204, 21.96, 23.252).

Boxing comes up next, between Epeios and Euryalos: Epeios has never appeared before; Euryalos has appeared just twice (2.565, 6.20). So it comes as no

surprise that Euryalos wins, and that the contest is kept short (around three minutes), since neither character needs much closure, as neither has much audience investment (23.657–99). Next, Achilles sets the contest for wrestling, with Telamonian Aias and Odysseus as competitors.¹⁴² The match ends in a tie, with Achilles calling it for both of them and giving them equal prizes (23.710–39). It, too, is short, but both men will yet make further appearances in the games. The pairing of these two men would also serve as an Easter egg for traditional audiences, a possible reference to their future conflict over Achilles' arms.

The prize for the foot race is brought out next: a silver mixing bowl that was part of the ransom that Euneos paid Patroklos for Priam's son Lykaon (23.740–9). This elaborates on the story of Lykaon's ransom (21.40–4), and reminds the audience of Lykaon's fate at Achilles' hands (21.97–127). The racers are Oilean Aias, Odysseus, and Antilochos (23.754–6): Athena helps Odysseus (as she always does), Aias trips in manure, and Antilochos comes in last (23.757–96). Everyone laughs at poor Aias (23.784), spitting out the cow-dung that had been scattered from the beasts sacrificed for Patroklos (23.776 recaps 23.166–9).¹⁴³

For the spear-fight, Achilles sets up Sarpedon's armour that Patroklos had stripped, as the prize (23.800 recapping 16.663–5): this recalls Patroklos's greatest victory over Sarpedon, and draws attention to his *aristeia* from Book 16. In addition to this prize, Achilles offers Asteropaios's sword to the man who draws first blood, again drawing attention to his victory in Book 21. Even though Achilles does not compete in any of the games, these prizes, related to Lykaon and Asteropaios, also glorify Achilles' military achievements, which are surprisingly few since he entered battle so late in the story: both Patroklos and Diomedes have more kills throughout the epic. Lykaon and Asteropaios are the only two men that Achilles kills in extended scenes besides Hektor in the *Iliad*. This spear-fight, too, ends in a draw, with the prizes evenly distributed, but Diomedes gets Asteropaios's sword (23.811–25).

Achilles next sets the throwing contest, in which Polypoites, Leonteus, Telamonian Aias and Epeios compete for a lump of iron captured from Achilles' sack of Thebe (23.827–9). This prize again calls back to Achilles' historical victories, while keeping Andromache in the mind of the audience.¹⁴⁴ With Aias the only main character in the mix, it comes as a surprise that Polypoites wins (23.826–49).¹⁴⁵ So Aias virtually fades out of the epic, and this might very well be a nod towards his demotion amidst the Achaians in tradition, but it does seem a shame that the man who held the Achaian line through so many battle sequences gets such short shrift in the epic's final episodes.

Archery is the next contest, which allows Teukros to come forward for the first time since Book 15 to compete against Meriones. They each try to shoot a dove tethered to a ship's mast: Teukros hits the string and frees the bird, but Meriones, after praying to Apollo, hits the bird herself (23.850–83). This bird's death – the last death in the epic – calls back to several heroic deaths, as her life-force (θυμὸς) flies fast from her limbs (23.880; cf. 7.131, 11.669, 13.672, 16.607).¹⁴⁶

Finally, Achilles sets up a spear and a cauldron as prizes for the spear-throwers, and Agamemnon, Idomeneus, and Meriones all stand up to compete. But Achilles just gives the cauldron to Agamemnon, and asks him, in turn, to give the spear to Meriones, which he does (23.884–97). This last beat brings a final resolution to the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, and serves as Agamemnon's own curtain call. This resolution suggests that a performer could certainly take a break here, before the final sequences of the epic.

Misery never sleeps: 24.1–22

After these Achaian curtain calls, the epic's final possible 'episode' turns back to Troy, and aims to find a resolution for Hektor's storyline, left dangling as long as his corpse lies besides Achilles' tent. Even though Hektor is dead, these final sequences focus almost exclusively on his fate: first, Achilles' continued abuse of his body; then, the gods' concern with the return of Hektor's corpse; the divine plan orchestrated to set up the ransom of the body; the enactment of that plan, with Priam ransoming Hektor's corpse; finally, the reception of Hektor's body in Troy and his funeral rites. Throughout these sequences, the epic and its characters emphasize aspects of memory, the connection between memory and grief, the memory of past events, the memories of Patroklos, and the memories of Hektor. These sequences allow space for its characters and its audience to reflect on past events, from both within and without the *Iliad's* narrative. But these reflections necessarily reframe character – particularly Hektor's character – and fix a certain image of him in our minds that lingers long after our experience of the *Iliad* has passed.

The narrative opens the episode by switching audience alignment to Achilles, after the games have broken up and the Achaians have gone to bed. Only Achilles stays up, tossing and turning, weeping as he longs for Patroklos, and remembers (24.3–6). He thinks how many things Patroklos achieved with him, and the pains he had suffered, and the wars of men, and cleaving through the painful waves (24.6–8). These memories are vague but build further backstory between the two

characters, and give greater justification for Achilles' extensive emotional response over Patroklos's death. Remembering these things, Achilles weeps, lies on his side, paces, and fastens Hektor once more to his chariot, dragging him over and over again round Patroklos's tomb, face down in the dust (24.9–18). This last detail calls previous 'episodes' to mind, where he first dragged Hektor's head after he killed him (22.400–3), and when he placed Hektor's body facedown back in the Achaian camp (23.25). Apollo protects the body as he did previously (24.18–21; cf. with Aphrodite, 23.185–91), but the beat still ends, 'So (Achilles), raging, kept dishonouring brilliant Hektor' (ὥς ὁ μὲν Ἴκτορα δῖον ἀείκιζεν μενεαίνων, 24.22). This short beat recaps the situation as alarmingly similar to what it was before Achilles buried Patroklos, with only the fact that Achilles drags Hektor around Patroklos's tomb even acknowledging the funeral. It has not brought any closure to Achilles or to Hektor.

Missions from gods: 24.23–188

The narrative switches beats by following the gaze of the gods from Hektor's corpse to Olympus: the narrative gives us access to the gods as they see Achilles' mistreatment of the body and pity Hektor (24.23–30). While most of the gods urge Hermes to steal the body, Poseidon, Hera, and Athena remained opposed to showing any leeway towards their hated Trojans (24.25–7). The narrative explains their lingering hatred, here at the end of this story, by alluding to the Judgement of Paris (24.27–30).¹⁴⁷

The scene switches through a rare jump forward in time:¹⁴⁸ on the twelfth dawn after Hektor's death, Apollo addresses the gods, entreating them to release Hektor's body to Priam. Apollo reminds the other gods that Hektor burnt the ox-thighs and perfect goats (24.34): this repeats Zeus's own claim that Hektor had sacrificed ox-thighs to him from Mount Ida, which Zeus used as justification when he considered letting Hektor live (22.168–76). Then Apollo brings up Hektor's family, who, even though he is a corpse, should be able to look on him and give him his funeral rites. Apollo is specific here, mentioning Hektor's wife, child, mother, and his father Priam in addition to the Trojan people (24.36-f.). So Apollo recaps Hektor's family structure, and, in naming Priam (24.37), prepares the audience for the central role that Hektor's father will play in the following beats. Apollo then berates the gods for their continued support of Achilles. He questions Achilles' constant mourning for Patroklos, saying that men must lose people who are even closer to them, and even so, they must stop mourning

(24.33–54). Apollo suggests that Achilles' grief process is unnatural among men, and outrageous to the gods, inviting the audience to assess their own allegiance to his character. The narrator has already shown, in the episode's first beat, that no matter how often Achilles drags Hektor, 'it doesn't get prettier for him, or better' (οὐ μὴν οἱ τό γε κάλλιον οὐδέ τ' ἄμεινον, 23.52).

Hera responds to Apollo by reminding the rest of the gods that Hektor was only a mortal, born to mortals, and so his honour should be less than that of Achilles, born to a goddess (24.56–63; contrast with 1.555–9). Then Hera elaborates on her character connection to Achilles in the backstory she gives about Achilles' mother Thetis, whom she raised up and gave away as a bride, and she reminds the gods that they all attended the wedding, so they also have a personal connection to Achilles through Thetis (24.60f.).¹⁴⁹

Zeus concedes that the gods must honour Achilles more, but also says that the gods loved Hektor most of all the men in Troy, and he confirms that he himself loved Hektor (24.66–8; cf. 22.186–76). Zeus also says that they will not steal the body because Thetis always protects Achilles, night and day (24.71–3). So Zeus decides to enlist Thetis to convince Achilles to return Hektor's body for Priam's ransom. This 'mission' builds audience anticipation for the next several beats, to see how Hektor's body will finally make its way back to Troy.

The next beat starts by keeping the audience aligned with Iris as she sinks like a lead weight into the sea to find Thetis (24.77–82). She finds Achilles' mother lamenting her son, with all of the other sea-nymphs around her: while this might not create an illusion of continuous action since she first started lamenting Achilles at 18.35,¹⁵⁰ it builds the idea that this is her default action, and recaps that Achilles' death is close at hand (24.52f.). So Iris finds her, and leads her, mourning in her dark veil, back to Zeus, with the narrative following (24.87–100).

Thetis's arrival at Olympus allows for several recaps from Zeus. He *knows* her motivation, when he tells her: 'You have come to Olympus, very upset, holding an unforgettable suffering in her thoughts – I know this myself' (κηδομένη περ,/ πένθος ἄλαστον ἔχουσα μετὰ φρεσίν, οἶδα καὶ αὐτός, 24.104f.).¹⁵¹ In correctly asserting what Thetis feels, Zeus reiterates the force of the last beat, reinforces their close relationship, and gives the audience further access into both of their characters. Then Zeus goes on to recap the current situation, saying that the gods have fought for nine days over what to do about Hektor's corpse (24.107):¹⁵² but now Zeus elaborates on this past and says that he stopped Hermes from stealing the body because Zeus still honours Achilles, in order to safeguard his future relationship with Thetis (24.110f. elaborates on 24.71–3). His honesty and

directness with Thetis would seem to confirm this desire to keep on good terms with the sea-nymph. Zeus then very delicately asks if Thetis will tell Achilles that Zeus is angry with him, 'so maybe he'll fear me and give Hektor back' (αἴ κέν πως ἐμέ τε δέιση ἀπό θ' Ἴκτορα λύσει, 24.116). Zeus then adds a second part to his plan, as he says that he himself will tell Priam to go to the ships and ransom his son, bringing gifts to Achilles that 'might melt his heart' (τά κε θυμὸν ἰήνη, 24.119). With this conditional language, Zeus creates audience anticipation for what he wants to happen while he allows for the possibility that what he wants might not happen: this ambiguity sparks audience engagement, as they wonder what will happen next.

The narrative follows Thetis as it switches scenes back to Achilles' camp, where he sits in his tent, lamenting: this, like Thetis's own lamentation, suggests a 'default' mode for Achilles that creates continuity with the last the audience saw him (24.3–22). Thetis comments on his lamentation when she asks Achilles how long he intends to go on without food, sleep, or sex (24.128–31). Then she says once again that Achilles will soon die (24.131f.; cf. 24.85f.), before repeating Zeus's message from the previous beat (24.134–6 recaps 24.113–15) and urging Achilles to give Hektor up. After all this debate, Achilles agrees, simply and shortly (24.138f.), resolving the ambiguity that Zeus's speech created in the last beat.

So the narrator leaves Thetis and Achilles and switches scenes to Zeus ordering Iris to go to Priam. Zeus's orders, as expected, repeat and elaborate what he has laid out in previous beats. Zeus repeats the thrust of the order, that Priam should go the ships with gifts to ransom Hektor from Achilles, to the letter (24.146f. = 24.118f.), but then he goes on with further instructions that will serve as a framework for the coming scenes: Priam should go alone, with just one man to manage his cart, he should not be afraid, Hermes will lead him, and Achilles will not kill him or let anyone else kill him (24.148–56). Zeus justifies this last part with an evaluation of Achilles' character: 'He is not thoughtless, or reckless, or offensive, but he will kindly spare a supplicating man' (οὔτε γάρ ἐστ' ἄφρων οὔτ' ἄσκοπος οὔτ' ἀλιτήμων, / ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἐνδυκέως ἰκέτω πεφιδήσεται ἀνδρός, 24.157f.). This asks the audience to reconsider their own allegiance with Achilles up until this point, which in turn might complicate their expectations of how he will behave in the coming beats. The audience has seen Achilles kill a suppliant (21.97–127) and has heard Apollo say that 'Achilles killed pity and had no shame' (ὡς Ἀχιλεὺς ἔλεον μὲν ἀπώλεσεν, οὐδέ οἱ αἰδῶς/ γίγνεται, 24.44f.). While this beat comes straight after Achilles' acceptance of Zeus's orders, there has been no indication that Zeus *knows* that Achilles has accepted them. So Zeus seems to speak out of a place of either great faith or great experience that this is how Achilles will act.

The narrative switches scenes again, following Iris as she approaches Priam. So the audience finds what she finds, and this too, allows another perspective what Hektor's death means for the Trojans:

ἴξεν δ' ἐς Πριάμοιο, κίχεν δ' ἔνοπῆν τε γόον τε.
 παῖδες μὲν πατέρ' ἀμφὶ καθήμενοι ἔνδοθεν αὐλῆς
 δάκρυσιν εἴματ' ἔφουρον, ὃ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι γεραιὸς
 ἐντυπὰς ἐν χλαίνῃ κεκαλυμμένος· ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλὴ
 κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῇ τε καὶ αὐχένι τοῖο γέροντος
 τὴν βᾶ κυλινδόμενος καταμήσατο χερσὶν ἔῃσι.
 θυγατέρες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἰδὲ νυοὶ ὠδύροντο
 τῶν μμνησκόμεναι οἳ δὴ πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ
 χερσὶν ὑπ' Ἀργείων κέατο ψυχὰς ὀλέσαντες.

She found Priam, and she found screaming and lamentation.

The sons sat all around their father in the courtyard,
 soaking their cloaks with tears, and in the middle of them, the old man,
 shrouded in his mantle, veiled. There was
 manure all over the old man's head and neck –
 he'd rolled in it and heaped it on with his hands.

And his daughters and his daughters-in-law lamented all over the house,
 remembering those, the many and the good,
 who lie dead, their lives destroyed at Argives' hands.

24.160–8

The scene Iris finds is another portrait of grief, but one that stands in stark contrast to that which started this episode off, Achilles at 24.3–22: Achilles was alone in his grief, and, as the gods evaluate it, it is beyond what it should be (cf. 24.44–54). There is no such evaluation for Priam's grief, which, if anything, Apollo has obliquely approved of when he said that the loss of a son is greater than the loss of a companion (24.46f.). And Priam is not alone: grieving sons and daughters and daughters-in-law surround him. There has been no funeral, no communal process for them to do anything else. Iris introduces herself so that Priam can recognize her before she relays Zeus's orders, which she repeats verbatim (24.175–87 = 24.146–58).

Priam and Hekabe: 24.189–227

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Priam as he readies the wagons. He asks Hekabe her advice on Iris's plan, repeating the main thrust of Zeus's

orders (24.118 = 24.146 = 24.195). Priam's diegetic retelling allows for another response that further complicates the audience's expectations of Achilles' character, and how he will act with Priam. Hekabe's response is a mash-up of previous scenes and episodes in her depiction of Achilles, of Hektor, and of herself. Hekabe asserts her relationship with Hektor twice in this speech, first when she speaks of Hektor's fate from when he was born (ὄτε μιν τέκον αὐτή, 24.210), then again when she speaks of what Achilles did 'to my child' (παιδὸς ἐμοῦ, 24.214). Reasserting Hektor *as* her son gives further depth to her emotional response to his death and to Achilles' killing him. When she hears Priam's Zeus-inspired plan, Hekabe cries out and balks at the idea of Priam approaching Achilles because in *her* experience of Achilles, he has killed many of her sons (24.204f.).¹⁵³ For Hekabe, Achilles is 'a savage and untrustworthy man who won't pity you, won't show you any respect' (ὠμηστής καὶ ἄπιστος ἀνὴρ ὃ γε οὐ σ' ἐλεήσει,/ οὐδέ τί σ' αἰδέσεται, 24.207f.); this calls back to Apollo's earlier assessment of Achilles, 'who has destroyed pity' (24.44). The word that Hekabe uses here for savage means 'raw-meat-eater' (ὠμηστής, 24.207), which serves as a callback for the audience, who might remember Achilles' wish that he wanted to eat Hektor's flesh in his refusal of Hektor's supplication (22.346–8).¹⁵⁴ Her evaluation of Achilles as not having pity or respect also calls back to that earlier scene, repeating Hektor's thoughts about Achilles before their confrontation (οὐ σ' ἐλεήσει,/ οὐδέ τί σ' αἰδέσεται, 22.123f.). Then she tells Priam that it was Hektor's destiny to be fed on by dogs, far from his parents (24.211); it was Hekabe herself who told Hektor that he would die far from his parents and feed the running dogs (22.88f.). Hekabe then makes an even stronger callback to Achilles as a savage, when she says that she herself wants to eat Achilles' liver for what he did to Hektor (22.212–14; cf. 22.346–8): her rage mirrors his, over lost love. Finally she explains her fierce anger with Achilles: 'Because he killed Hektor, when Hektor was no coward, but making a stand before the Trojans and the deep-chested Trojan woman, not thinking of fear or flight' (ἐπεὶ οὐ ἐκακίζόμενον γε κατέκτα,/ ἀλλὰ πρὸ Τρώων καὶ Τρωιάδων βαθυκόλπων/ ἐσταότ' οὔτε φόβου μνησθένον οὔτ' ἄλεωρῆς, 24.214–16). Hekabe revises her own experience of Hektor, or, perhaps, omits some part of it. The audience all saw Hektor run from Achilles (22.136–232), and the narrative used unforgettable images to describe that flight, like men running as if in a dream (22.199–201).¹⁵⁵ But Hektor finds the courage to face Achilles three times in that episode (first, when he alone stands outside the Trojan walls, second, when he thinks Deiphobos stands beside him, third, when he realizes that he will die): it is, perhaps, this last stand that Hekabe conveniently thinks of now, and so invites the audience to think of.

Priam's response does not dispute Hekabe's character assessment of Achilles, but rather reasserts the rightness in following the gods' advice (24.218–27). Priam actually accepts the fact that Achilles might kill him, but he thinks it is worth it: 'Achilles can kill me as soon as I've taken my son in my arms and sated my appetite for mourning' (αὐτίκα γὰρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεὺς/ ἀγκὰς ἐλόντ' ἐμὸν υἷόν, ἐπήν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἶην, 24.226). With the two speeches back-to-back, Priam's speech trumps Hekabe's – he, too, focuses on Hektor being his child, but does not want just to kill for him – Priam is willing to die for him.

Curtains for curses: 24.228–321

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Priam into the next beat, as he makes his way through the city. After he loads up his wagon, he insults the Trojans. He tells them it will be easier for them to be slaughtered now that Hektor is dead; he knows that Troy will fall, and he would rather die before he sees it happen (24.239–46). Then he sees his sons and curses them. This plays like an anti-catalogue to Patroklos's funeral games – a last moment to see many of the Trojan heroes that have appeared here and there throughout the epic (Helenos, Paris, Agathon, Pammon, Antiphonos, Polites, Deiphobos, Hippothoös, Dios; 24.249f.). But now, after Hektor's death, through Priam's eyes, they are not heroes. Priam wishes they had all died, rather than Hektor – Hektor who was like a god, whom Priam ranks with Mestor and Troilos (24.253–9), whose heroic exploits would be known to a traditional audience.¹⁵⁶ But next to Hektor, Priam sees his remaining nine sons as 'cheats and dancers and chorus-leaders and robbers of lambs and kids among their own people' (ψεῦσταί τ' ὄρχησται τε χοροϊτυπήσιν ἄριστοι/ ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἀρπακτῆρες, 24.261f.). Hektor is the bar against which all the others are measured; this calls back to when Priam told Hektor that the grief from his death would be worse than from his other sons (22.52–5). Finally, Priam orders them to help ready his wagon, and they scurry in fear of the old man (24.263–7). So the narrative leaves Priam's other sons.

Hekabe comes to Priam and convinces him to pour a libation to Zeus, and Priam agrees (24.283–313): a bird-sign follows to give Priam further assurance that his trip to Achilles is god-approved, and to recap that fact from earlier in the episode (24.314–21). It is only once Priam (and his herald Idaeos) are outside the city that we get another view on Hektor.

Hermes: 24.322–467

As Priam and Idaios make their way out of the city, the narrative switches beats by aligning the audience with Zeus, who watches them from above (24.331f.). Zeus sends Hermes to go and help Priam (fulfilling his plan from 24.152–4), and the narrative follows Hermes, disguised as a young man, before switching alignment back to Priam and Idaios (24.359). This alignment switch builds audience anticipation as Idaios makes Hermes out, and speaks to Priam, concerned about who the man might be (24.351–60).

But Hermes is the first to speak, and asks Priam, ‘Are you all abandoning holy Iliion, scared? Because your son who died was *that* excellent – he lacked nothing at all in the fight against the Achaians’ (ἢ ἤδη πάντες καταλείπετε Ἴλιον ἱρήν/ δειδιότες· τοῖος γὰρ ἀνὴρ ὄριστος ὄλωλε/ σὸς πάϊς· οὐ μὲν γάρ τι μάχης ἐπιδέυετ’ Ἀχαιῶν. 24.383–5). Hermes says this from the point of view of an Achaian (he will claim to be Achilles’ attendant), and so convincingly mirrors Achilles’ own question after Hektor’s death, when he asked his men if they should go to Troy to see if the city would fight on after losing Hektor (22.381–4).

Priam then asks the nameless man who he is, ‘since he has said fine things about my son’s unlucky fate’ (ὥς μοι καλὰ τὸν οἶτον ἀπότμου παιδὸς ἔνισπες. 24.388). So Hermes goes on, explaining that he has seen Hektor fighting many times, because he is Achilles’ henchman (24.390–400). The exchange between them continues, as Priam asks if Hektor’s body is still in the Achaian camp, or if he has been hacked to pieces and fed to the dogs (23.406–9): Achilles had promised Patroklos to do this (23.21; 23.183), but we know that he did not. The narrative again engages its melodramatic alignment structure, as Priam’s ignorance means that Hermes’ response can recap all the treatment of Hektor’s corpse from past scenes. He says the dogs have not eaten Hektor (24.411 recaps 23.184–6), that Hektor’s corpse has laid for twelve days (24.413 recaps 24.30), but remains unchanged, even though Achilles drags it around Patroklos’s tomb (24.416f. recaps 24.14–18), but Hektor’s body remains pristine (24.419f. recaps 24.18f.). Even the wounds from the many men who stabbed him have closed (24.420f. recaps 22.369–75), so much have the gods loved Hektor (24.422f. recaps 24.66–8).

Priam’s response reinforces views of Hektor’s character from earlier in the episode, as Priam offers ‘the young man’ a present, giving as a reason ‘my son, if I ever had one, never forgot in his halls the gods who hold Olympos’ (ἐπει οὐ ποτ’ ἐμὸς πάϊς, εἴ ποτ’ ἔην γε./ λήθετ’ ἐνὶ μεγάροισι θεῶν οἱ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσι. 24.426f.; cf. 22.168–76, 24.33f., 24.68–7). Hermes refuses the gift because he does

not want to steal from Achilles: so his answer contains another callback to the epic's initial quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon (24.424–39).

The narrative follows them across the plain, as Hermes puts the guards to sleep and brings Priam to Achilles' shelter, and finally reveals himself (24.440–71). Hermes tells Priam that he should supplicate Achilles by his father, his mother, and his child, setting Priam's task for the next scene (24.465–7), and building audience anticipation for what is to come.

Supplication: 24.468–571

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Priam as Hermes goes back to Olympos and Priam goes into Achilles' tent (24.468–71). Achilles sits with Automedon and Alkimos, just finishing his dinner: this detail calls back to Thetis's speech to Achilles just a few beats earlier, urging him to quit his mourning and eat something, suggesting that Achilles is already in a different place than the last time the narrative aligned with him (24.475f.; cf. 24.128–30). Something has changed.

As Priam wraps his arms around Achilles' knees and kisses his hands, the narrator draws attention to Achilles' hands as having killed so many of Priam's sons, echoing Hekabe from earlier in the episode (24.478f.; cf. 24.203–5) or Priam himself from his supplication to Hektor (22.43f.). This emphasis raises audience anticipation for what Achilles will do next, since Hekabe had assumed that his violence would carry over onto Priam himself (24.206–8). Priam starts his speech with a call for Achilles to remember his father, following one of the directions from Hermes from the previous beat (24.486; cf. 24.466). Priam says that Peleus will be happy that Achilles still lives (24.486–92), but goes on to elaborate the sons that he himself has lost to the war (24.493–8 elaborates on 22.43f.).

Then Priam's speech turns to Hektor, the 'only one still left to me, and he defended the city and the Trojans, and you killed him a little while ago, while he was defending his country: Hektor' (ὄς δέ μοι οἴος ἔην, εἴρωτο δὲ ἄστῃ καὶ αὐτούς,/ τὸν σὺ πρῶην κτεῖνας ἀμυνόμενον περὶ πάτρης/Ἑκτορα, 24.499–501). Other characters have seen Hektor as the sole defender of Troy before, in the Trojans' affectionate gift of Astyanax's name (6.407, 22.507), in Sarpedon's and Glaukos's mocking Hektor's purported boasts (5.474, 17.145), and, finally, in that image of Hektor, alone, outside the Skaian gates, waiting for Achilles' onslaught. There Priam screamed at Hektor not to let himself be cut off alone (22.39);

Andromache feared that Hektor's being cut off alone was exactly what had happened (22.456). The patriotic bent of Priam's description also rings a bell, riffing as it does on Hektor's famous 'the best bird-sign is to defend your country' (εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης, 12.243; cf. ἀμυνόμενον περὶ πάτρης here at 24.501). Finally, Priam's demand that Achilles honour the gods calls back to the beats at the beginning of the episode where the gods orchestrated this whole plan (24.104–19), and so, with this divine reminder, points towards an imminent resolution.

In a series of memorable gesture-responses,¹⁵⁷ Achilles takes Priam's hand and pushes him away, so that Priam sits at his feet as they both weep, Priam for Hektor, Achilles for Patroklos and his own father (24.507–12). Finally, Achilles speaks, and he repeats Hekabe's earlier incredulity at Priam's audacity in coming to him (24.519–21 = 24.203–5). Achilles talks of his own father, and of Priam's misfortunes, too, recalling the past of Priam's former wealth as a backstory that gives his present condition more *pathos* (24.543–6; cf. 18.288–92).¹⁵⁸

Priam tries to hurry Achilles to give back Hektor's body (24.552–9). But Achilles reassures Priam of his intention to return the body and not to provoke him to offend the gods (24.560–70). In this reassurance, he recaps previous beats in the episode, saying that Thetis brought him a message from Zeus about giving the body back (24.561f. recaps 24.120–42), and then guessing that a god helped Priam through the camp (24.563–7 recaps 24.349–68). Priam sits scared at Achilles' threat, as Achilles himself leaves the tent to tend to Hektor's body.

Promises, promises: 24.572–95

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Achilles as it follows him out of his tent. As he prepares Hektor's body, cleaning it and wrapping it and finally putting it onto Priam's bier, he calls out to Patroklos. He begs his dead friend not to be angry that he has returned Hektor's corpse, and promises Patroklos a share of the spoils (24.591–5). With this, Achilles recaps and reframes his earlier promises that he would bring Patroklos Hektor's head and armour (18.333–7) and that he would give Hektor to the dogs (23.19–23, 23.180–3). Achilles leaves these promises behind with this small expression of regret. But it signals an important closure for Achilles and Patroklos and marks the end of Patroklos's storyline.

Eat, drink, plan a funeral: 24.596–676

When Achilles returns to the tent, he diegetically retells Priam that Hektor is now on a bier (24.599f. recaps 24.587–90), and then asks him to have dinner. This creates a sense of how much time has passed in Achilles' preparations of the body, as when the narrative arrived at Achilles' tent, he had just finished eating, and that was less than ten minutes ago in performance time (24.475f.); hours seemed to have passed in the story.¹⁵⁹ Achilles tells the story of Niobe to convince Priam to eat,¹⁶⁰ saying that he can take Hektor back to Troy in the morning to mourn him, and Priam accepts (24.602–27). When they have finished eating, Priam asks for a place to sleep, and then he recaps his own grieving process: he has not slept, nor had he eaten until now,¹⁶¹ he even recaps the narrative's description of himself, sat coated in dung in the courtyard (24.639f.), where the narrative and Iris found him at 24.162–4, now over a half hour ago in performance. These details all call to mind the earlier state of things, and start to speak to that grieving period's coming end.

Achilles sets up a place for Priam to sleep, explaining that he should sleep outside because Agamemnon might discover that Priam is in Achilles' tent if some Achaian should come in to find him (24.643–55). Now Achilles asserts his autonomy from Agamemnon, asking Priam how many days he needs for Hektor's funeral. Priam acknowledges the immensity of this gesture in his response: 'If you're willing to let me make a tomb for brilliant Hektor, you could do this Achilles, and it'd be a huge favour to me.' (εἰ μὲν δὴ μ' ἐθέλεις τελέσαι τάφον Ἑκτορι δίω,/ ὠδέ κέ μοι ῥέζων Ἀχιλεῦ κεχαρισμένα θείης. 24.660f.) Achilles agrees to the timeframe that Priam asks for, where they will fight again on the twelfth day, and assures the old man with a wrist-grab (24.668–72).¹⁶² This is Achilles' last speech in the epic, and the whole beat sequence with Priam serves as his curtain call. With Achilles' statement that Priam can take Hektor tomorrow, and making Priam a bed, and this funeral agreed to, the narrative lays down a clear timeline for the audience to anticipate in the beats to follow.

Midnight run: 24.677–91

The narrative immediately upsets this timeline. Both men go to their beds – Achilles, significantly, with Briseis (calling back to Thetis's advice that Achilles start to have sex again at 24.128–32) – but in the middle of the night Hermes awakens Priam, and urges him to leave the camp and return to Troy (24.677–88).

Like Achilles in the previous beat, Hermes points to Agamemnon as a problem (24.687; cf. 24.654), but suggests that he will capture Priam alive if he sees him in the Achaian camp. These two references to Agamemnon as a counter-force to Achilles, sandwiched around Achilles' reunification with Briseis (24.675f.), call back the quarrel of Book 1, and create the sense of an uneasy resolution that upsets Agamemnon's curtain call at the end of the games (23.887–97).¹⁶³

Troy-time: 24.691–722

The narrative keeps the audience aligned with Priam and Idaios as it follows them back across the plains, to the river Xanthos (a small curtain call of the raging river from Book 21), where Hermes leaves them as the sun comes up (24.690–7). The scene switches the audience's alignment then, following a gaze back from the approaching wagon to Cassandra, Priam's daughter, who stands on the peak of Pergamos (24.697–703). The narrative makes much of the fact that Cassandra alone is the first to see the wagon approaching with Hektor's corpse on it (οὐδέ τις ἄλλος/ ἔγνω πρόσθ' ἀνδρῶν καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν, 24.697f.): this is the first time that she appears in the whole epic (although she is mentioned as a promised bride back at 13.366), and her appearance looks forward to the next poems in the cycle.¹⁶⁴ Cassandra here acts like a sting at the end of a Marvel movie, looking forward to the next film in a series of interconnected stories. She appears here because she will play a major role in the fall of Troy, in her warnings to the Trojans, in her surviving Aias's rape, and in her being given to Agamemnon.¹⁶⁵ That she is the first and only one to see Hektor's corpse, an image connected so frequently to the fall of Troy (cf. 6.447–65, 22.382–4, 22.410f.), foreshadows her role later in the epic cycle.

Kassandra's cry to the people, if ever they were joyful to see Hektor coming back out of battle alive, suggests an odd parallel comfort, an ironic callback to the Trojans' joyful response to Hektor's surviving his single combat with Aias: that seems like a lifetime ago, over fourteen hours of performance time (7.307–10; cf. 17.207). The scene that follows, showing all the Trojan men *and* women crowd round the gates is another sad callback to that earlier time, when Hektor returned to Troy and all the women crowded around him to get news of the men who have died (6.237–41). As Priam enters the gates, the first to come to side of the bier are Andromache and Hekabe, who tear their hair and touch Hektor's head (24.710–12). To emphasize the stream of emotion that happens at this encounter at the gates, the narrative offers up another contrafactual, saying that

they would have remained there all day crying if Priam had not intervened so that they can bring Hektor inside (24.713–15).¹⁶⁶

Eulogies: 24.723–76

There are three long speeches over Hektor, each of which recaps important points established in the past that have a specific bearing on the speaker, and which look forward towards their future fates. In recapping different past information, each speech also draws attention to different aspects of Hektor's character. Andromache is the first to lament, holding her husband's head in her hands – the narrative calls Hektor 'man-slaughtering' (ἀνδροφόνοιο, 24.724; cf. 6.498). This detail creates a startling juxtaposition between Hektor's violence and his domestic role with his wife, but also demonstrates the result of Hektor's violence in his corpse. Andromache starts her speech by accusing Hektor of leaving her a widow (24.725f.), answering the accusation that she spoke to the living Hektor that he would leave her widowed (6.408). Then she sees the fall of Troy, where Astyanax will never come of age, where the wives will be taken off in hollow ships. All these visions have been seen before, and they will be seen again, because in some other story, they will come true. In some other story, some Achaian will throw Astyanax from the walls to his death. But the reason why remains in this story, and Andromache recaps countless deaths that Hektor caused when he killed fathers and brothers and sons, beaten down at his hands just like Achilles threatened they would be (24.736–8; cf. 1.242f.). Andromache says that Hektor was not 'gentle' in the battle (μείλιχος, 24.739).¹⁶⁷ So she invites the audience to remember – is that true? Was he fierce? Was he cruel?

Andromache addresses the last part of her speech to Hektor's corpse, which the performer could conjure in the space: she tells him that his people and his parents are lamenting, but her pain is the worst. So she mirrors Hektor's own hierarchy of pain, where she feels the most for him as he said he felt the most for her (24.742f.; cf. 6.450–65).¹⁶⁸ Immediately after this, she denies an alternative space where Hektor's battle-fury had not propelled him to die on the battlefield. In that other world, he had died in bed, stretched his arms out to her, whispered one last word to her to remember always (24.743–5). Her fantasy ironically inverts the physical reality of Andromache's pose at the moment, holding her husband's head in her hands (24.724). At the same time, the image creates a sharp contrast with the actual scenes of his death (which Andromache did not see, but the narrator and the audience did) and the abuse of his corpse (which

everyone 'saw', 22.321–63). It is as though Andromache tries to superimpose a different memory of Hektor's death on those gruesome images, and cannot.

Hekabe speaks next, and, addressing her whole speech to the corpse, she shifts focus to recap Hektor's death at the hands of Achilles and the divine preservation of his corpse. Her short speech recaps an amazing number of details from previous episodes, some of which she herself did not see. First, that Achilles had captured and ransomed many of her sons to islands (24.750–3 recaps 21.34–48, 21.100–2, 22.45), but that he killed Hektor (24.754 recaps 22.321–64). Then, that he had dragged Hektor's corpse around his companion Patroklos's tomb (24.755f. recaps 24.14–18), whom Hektor killed (24.756 recaps 16.818–57). Then she says that Hektor's corpse is handsome and dewy (24.757 recaps 23.186–910, 24.18–21, 24.419), like some young man that Apollo had shot with his arrows (24.758f.).¹⁶⁹ With that simile, she implicitly likens Hektor to one of Niobe's sons, and so herself to Niobe, who loses all her children and turns to stone through mourning. Achilles told that story just about ten minutes ago in performance time (24.602–17). While Andromache's speech spoke to the loss that she feels with Hektor's death, and what that means for her, her son, and the city in the future, Hekabe's speech recaps, in detail, with roles and names repeated, the chain of events that led to that death.

Helen speaks last,¹⁷⁰ and her focus shifts to describing Hektor himself in her grief. She, too, repeats names, relationships, and roles. Hektor was her favourite brother-in-law (24.762; cf. 6.344, 6.355). Alexandros is her husband who brought her to Troy (24.763f.). She wishes now that she had died rather than leaving her home to come here (24.764–6 elaborates on 6.345–8). But Hektor never insulted her, not even when her other brothers and sisters-in-law, even her mother-in-law (who stands beside her), have been cruel (24.767–72). Hektor was kind to her, and a friend to her (24.774f.). So, like Briseis and the other captive women before her, she mourns for the dead man who was kind to her as she mourns for herself (24.773; cf. 19.301f.). The audience has rarely glimpsed this Hektor: perhaps in that moment at the end of Book 6, when he tells Paris how much it hurts him that others insult his brother (6.523–5). Helen's Hektor, kindest, most foreign to us, is the last Hektor that the narrative presents.¹⁷¹

Funeral: 24.777–804

Priam has the last speaking part in the *Iliad*, as he orders the men to bring wood into the city, and recaps Achilles' promise that they will not fight again until the

twelfth day (24.778–81 recaps 24.659–70). The Trojans spend nine days bringing in timber (24.783f.). On the tenth day, they burn Hektor's body on the pyre (24.785–7). On the eleventh day, they take Hektor's bones, bury them and have a funeral feast (24.788–803).

So they went about the funeral of horse-breaking Hektor.

(On the twelfth day, somewhere else, fighting began again.)

Conclusion: Reruns

Ἀνδρομάχης ἔτι θρῆνον ἀκούομεν, εἰσέτι Τροίην
δερκόμεθ' ἐκ βάρων πᾶσαν ἐρειπομένην
Καὶ μόθον Αἰάντειον, ὑπὸ στεφάνῃ τε πόλιος
ἔκδετον ἐξ ἵππων Ἑκτορα συρόμενον . . .

Andromache still laments – we hear her. And we still see
all of Troy being torn down from its foundations,
and Aias's battle-din, and beneath the crown of the city,
tied behind the horses, Hektor, dragged . . .

Alphaios

When I began this project, I was traumatized: that image of Hektor, dragged, his face that was before so lovely, tumbling in the dust was graven, branded on my mind. I could not stop mourning for Hektor. I always felt as though I stood on the wall beside Andromache when she first sees him there, dragged. So I started this book, and it was about Hektor, and it was about death. And for that, I started this project by translating Book 22. Then I produced and directed a performance of Books 21 and 22, and for months of working on the show, I heard Hektor's death hundreds of times. Hektor's death had been everything to me, and then I made it an even stronger focus of my obsession. A couple of months after the second run of *Iliad* 21/22, I interviewed the director Stathis Livathinos about his recent production of the *Iliad*. I told him what I had done, that I had made this *Iliad* that was Hektor's death. He told me that this was like putting on the *Oedipus Tyrannos*, only to pull the curtain back at its start to show Oedipus there, with his eyes already out. It was then that I realized I had forgotten my experience of the *Iliad* itself. The *Iliad*, it turns out, was the cure for the very trauma that it had caused. So this book became something very different.

Reading back through and back through the whole *Iliad*, it feels more and more like television. 'Serialized dramas privilege process over product . . . the "getting there" – the journey – is key.'¹ All those tiny details and thousand characters

that the narrator pulls together like a magic trick, keeping track of a whole expanding universe in his mind. What a pleasure it is to see this trick, to see all of its myriad intricate working parts, to participate in that trick and try to fit those parts together. No need to rush towards Hektor's death, or to hurry up, gobble it whole, and turn away. No, now, with this book, the time to revel in every scene.

This approach has helped my appreciation of the *Iliad*, and I hope that it might open it up for others as well. This has been a cursory overview, one reading of the *Iliad* within the poetics of serial narrative, and how its characterizations fit within those same poetics. Beat by beat, through episodes and arcs, the *Iliad* slowly parcels out its pieces of narrative and character information, building character recognition, alignment, and allegiance in its audience. The *Iliad* builds not just one character through this serial narrative, but many, which, in turn, allow its narrative to fan out laterally, to grow and expand, to continue to build audience anticipation and to delay the pleasures of resolution in the primary characters' story arc. The *Iliad's* multiplicity of alignments is its greatest strength. Its melodramatic alignment structure lets events ricochet between characters, emotional responses and consequences like ripples on the water after a stone is thrown in the pond. At any given moment, our allegiances can shift and alter and come into conflict as the narrative shows us its characters in diverse scenarios and interactions and conversations.

Hektor stands apart from me, as he ever has, unknowable as anyone, but familiar just the same. He might kill you on the battlefield and try to cut off your head. He might just run away. He might inspire you to fight for him, or threaten your life even when you fight for him, or give you orders that get you killed. He has kindness in him, and cruelty. Bravery and fear, stubbornness and adaptability. The *Iliad* succeeds because it leaves me feeling like I wish I knew him better: I wish I could have spent still more time with him. Perhaps I am unduly influenced by Andromache, and her richly imagined alternative for Hektor, where he died in her arms, whispering something unforgettable, something comforting, in her ear (24.743–5).

As I have searched for Hektor through the *Iliad*, and its many characters with its many beats, new favourites have emerged. Menelaos feels constant, loyal, right. Aias remains a bulwark, and feels, perhaps appropriately, taken for granted, not just by other characters, but by the narrative itself. The gods have become more interesting. There is comfort in alignment with the gods, even as there is pain. They have real emotional investments, and they can be wounded, but they do not die like our favourite heroes do. With *Game of Thrones* constantly killing off its fans' favourite characters, especially when they seemed to kill Jon Snow, a

campaign started to support the ‘white walkers’ – zombie-like creatures that cannot be killed.² Sometimes the pain of character allegiance can be too much.

As I lay out my own new feelings about the *Iliad*’s characters, having spent so much time with them while writing this book, the research avenue that opens up widest moving forward involves the interrelated issues of parasocial connections to serial narrative and how fandom affects serial narratives. It might seem forced to compare the parasocial possibilities of a show that lasts many years to a performed epic that lasts many days, but in both a sense of familiarity grows. If the Homeric epics were performed often, and there certainly seems to be evidence that at least in later periods they were well known by a wide range of people, then it seems very plausible that audiences would form long-term relationships to those characters. Television critics now excitedly explore the transmedia natures of primary serial narratives and their characters. Now shows have accompanying websites or comic books or webisodes, all of which can affect and interact with the principle serial narrative as it progresses, not to mention fansites and episode-by-episode recaps and reviews. This makes me more curious about the Homeric tradition, which obviously also existed transmedially, where audience members might have heard or seen different versions of the *Iliad*’s pieces before or after seeing the *Iliad* itself performed. The rise of fan fiction also piques my curiosity: there has been an evolving trend for ‘fans’ of shows or popular media franchises to begin to influence the course of that franchise, from Ronald D. Moore joining *Star Trek: The Next Generation* as a writer to Simon Pegg first starring in and then writing the new *Star Trek* film series,³ complete with fan input,⁴ or to J.J. Abrams taking over the *Star Wars* franchise. Bryan Fuller’s *Hannibal* is perhaps the most compelling product of this trend. Not only does Bryan Fuller approach the source material of Thomas Harris’s novels as though writing fan fiction – imagining an intimate relationship between Will Graham and Hannibal Lecter beyond what exists in the source – but the show pushed this dynamic further in response to fans’ positive responses to that relationship. Bryan Fuller discusses his process of working on *Hannibal*:

‘That’s the fun of an adaptation – you know the story works because you’ve read it before. And in this case, not only had I read it before but I’d seen a couple of movies that have covered the same territory. It’s up to me to make that story fresh for the audience that’s tuning into this program, but it also becomes a fan fiction of sorts.’⁵

The *Iliad* too, as scholars have shown, must have gone through similar processes of artist/fans putting their spin on the epic:⁶ later genres and generations certainly

revisited the Homeric tradition with their own 'fan' versions as well (long before *Hannibal*, there was Aeschylus's *Achilleis*). Being such a fan of a character or characters that one wants to recreate them in a new version of a story is a constructive apex of the parasocial relationships that all audiences form, particularly with serial narratives. This interest in parasocial relationships with serial narratives has emerged from the very act of writing this book, which has shifted my own character allegiances and complicated my own relationships with the *Iliad*'s characters.

The strength of these parasocial relationships that we form with the characters of serial narrative keeps us coming back to a story. The combination of our allegiance/parasocial relationships and the ludic nature of serial narratives and their characterizations not only inspires loyalty over the course of a narrative, but also allows pleasure in repeated experiences. In this past summer, I have read through the *Iliad* many times as I have watched and re-watched entire serials: *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine*, *Game of Thrones*, *Rectify*, and *Hannibal* among many others. And each time, in each story, I have made new discoveries and found new pleasures. And then I reach the end. And at the end, I am not ready to let go of the characters. And at the end, I still want to know what happens next. And at the end, I am left with a nagging curiosity of how we all got to the end.

So then, because I am an addict, I start once more at the beginning.

Notes

Introduction: Binge-watching the *Iliad*

- 1 'Mads Mikkelsen Loves the Slow Build (Interview)', *Hannibal* Season 3 cast interviews at <http://www.spoilertv.com/2015/05/hannibal-season-3-cast-video-interviews.html>
- 2 Schein, S. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (University of California Press, 1984), 30; Taplin, O. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford University Press, 1992), 5; Russo, J. 'Is "Oral" or "Aural" Composition the Cause of Homer's Formulaic Style?' in *Oral Poetry and the Formula*, ed. B.A. Stolz and R.S. Shannon (University of Michigan Press, 1976), 31–54 suggests that we shift from the question of just *how* orally composed the poems are, and instead focus on their *aurality*.
- 3 Here I follow Jasper Griffin, who complained that the 'Homeric Question', which morphed from one of authorship to one of the limits of orality with the oral theory introduced in the early twentieth century, had 'so often dominated discussion even to the point of eclipsing the poems themselves . . .' Griffin, J. *Homer on Life and Death* (Clarendon Press, 1980), xvi. For a comprehensive exploration of the arguments for and against the orality of the epic poems, see Jensen, M.S. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Museum Tusulanum, 1980); for an extensive examination of 'Homer', see Kahane, A. *Diachronic Dialogues: Authority and Continuity in Homer and the Homeric Tradition* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), especially ch. 1–3.
- 4 For arguments for paratactic composition of the *Iliad*, see Notopoulos, J. 'Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach in Homeric Literary Criticism', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80 (1949) 1–23.
- 5 For consideration of the *Iliad* as serial literature, Oliver Taplin says it best (and I follow his approach to the *Iliad* more generally): ' . . . (the *Iliad*) is still best appreciated if taken as a whole. The next step is crucial: the *Iliad* was and is shaped to be received by its audience in sequence, from the beginning to the end in that order.' *Homeric Soundings*, 10; Minchin, E. 'Serial repetition in Homer and the "Poetics of Talk": a case study from the *Odyssey*', *Oral Tradition* 14/2 (1999) 336–53, is not explicit about the Homeric poems as serial narrative, but makes note of the importance of their serial-ness for audience response. Ruth Scodel and Cedric Whitman's article 'Sequence and Simultaneity in *Iliad* N, E, and O', *Harvard Studies*

- in *Classical Philology* 85 (1981) 1–15, discusses the importance of sequence in Iliadic narrative, but not on the experience of the *Iliad* as a serial. For the *Iliad* as a forerunner of the serial television form, see Petersen, B. 'Den serielle fortælleform Fra *Iliaden* til den moderne tv-serie', *Kosmorama* 248 (2011) 7–36, 9. Petersen counts its complex narrative structure (*flerstrengede struktur*) and its large character cast (*store persongalleri*) among the features that qualify the *Iliad* as a proto-serial form.
- 6 For a full discussion of how cognitive processes of memory work for the Homeric performer, see Minchin, E. *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. (Oxford University Press, 2001).
 - 7 Narration time as opposed to discourse time or story time.
 - 8 In my own memorized performance work with the *Iliad*, without blocking (or, to be fair, *acting*), I average about fifteen lines a minute.
 - 9 Almeida Theater, 'The Iliad Online', <http://www.almeida.co.uk/iliad-online>.
 - 10 Many thanks to Katherine Kretler for sharing this information, based on her performance work done in conjunction with her excellent doctoral thesis, 'One Man Show'. Kretler, K. 'One Man Show: *Poiesis* and genesis in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*' (PhD diss., University of Chicago, Chicago, 2011).
 - 11 Daitz's recorded performance of *Iliad* lines 1–52 takes 6:01, as accessed at Society for the Oral Reading of Greek and Latin Literature (SORGLL), 'Homer, *Iliad*, Book 1, Lines 1–52', <http://www.rhapsodes.fll.vt.edu/Iliad/iliad.htm>.
 - 12 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 27.
 - 13 See Heiden, B. 'The three movements of the *Iliad*', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 37.1 (1996) 5–22 for a discussion of previous proposals by Wade-Gery, Davison, Schadewalt, Taplin, and Stanley. Louden also suggests a tri-partite performance structure, though his analysis 'is not based on consideration of performance, since our notions of performance are too conjectural to offer a sound basis for interpretation'. See also Louden, B. *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006) 2.
 - 14 Heiden, 'Three movements', 6.
 - 15 See Burgess, J. 'Performance and the Epic Cycle', *Classical Journal* 100 (2004) 1–23, 8 n. 34.
 - 16 Notopoulos, J.A. 'Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964) 1–77, 8–9.
 - 17 Lord, A.B. 'Homer and Huso I: The Singer's Rests in Greek and South-slavic Heroic Song', *TAPA* 67 (1936) 106–13.
 - 18 An excellent example of this kind of performance length is the Hypocrites' production of Sean Graney's *All Our Tragic* (2014–15), which consists of eight acts over twelve hours, including breaks of various lengths between each act. The National Theatre of Wales' 2015 production of Christopher Logue's *Iliad: Marathon*,

- directed by Mike Pearson and Mike Brookes, took place in four two-hour acts with breaks of an hour or an hour and a half between each.
- 19 See Ahl, F. 'Homer, Vergil, and complex narrative structures in Latin epic: an essay', *Illinois Classical Studies*, (1989), Mittell, J. 'Narrative complexity in contemporary American television', *The Velvet Light Trap*, no. 58, vol. 1 (2006), and Mittell, J. *Complex TV: The poetics of contemporary television storytelling* (New York University Press, 2015) for definitions of ancient epic and contemporary television serials as 'complex narratives'.
- 20 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 10.
- 21 Television studies have frequently compared and contrasted the contemporary serial with serialized novels, particularly those of Dickens. See Sconce, J. 'Dickens, Selznick, and Southpark', in *Dickens on Screen*, ed. John Glavin (Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jones, S.E. 'Dickens on "Lost": Text, Paratext, Fan-based Media', *The Wordsworth Circle* 38.1 (2007); Lavery, D. 'Lost and long-term television narrative' in *Third Person: Authoring and Exploring Vast Narratives*, eds Pat Harrigan and Noah Wardrip-Fruin (MIT Press, 2009) 313–22; O'Sullivan, S. 'Reconnoitering the Rim: Thoughts on *Deadwood* and *Third Seasons*' in *Third Person*, 323–33; O'Sullivan, S. 'Broken on Purpose: Poetry, Serial Television, and the Season', *StoryWorlds: A Journal of Narrative Studies*, 2.1 (2010) 59–77; Plotz, J. 'Serial Pleasures: The Influence of Television on the Victorian Novel', *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net*, 63 (2013): <https://www.erudit.org/revue/ravon/2013/v/n63/1025619ar.html> [accessed June 2016]; Hayward, J. *Consuming Pleasures: Active Audiences and Serial Fictions from Dickens to Soap Opera* (University Press of Kentucky, 1997).
- 22 Holland, P. *The Television Handbook* (Routledge Press, 2000) 112.
- 23 End-points are a fairly new feature of American serials, though they have been consistently present in British programmes and in mini-series, which have traditionally been shorter and commissioned in one series at a time. Even *Lost* (ABC, 2004–10) was only able to set an end-point after its third season due to commercial constraints. Lavery suggests marking a difference between British serials and more open-ended American serials like *Lost*, as he advocates for only the latter qualifying as 'long-term television narrative': Lavery, D. 'Lost and Long-Term Television Narrative', in *Third Person*, 313–22. O'Sullivan makes the interesting proposal that only the first two seasons of most television shows can be 'contained', after which narratives become 'many more hours than can be squeezed simultaneously within a continuous spectatorial perspective': O'Sullivan, 'Broken on Purpose', 326. For most cable television shows, two seasons come to between twenty to twenty-four hours of show time, a close parallel to the performance time of the *Iliad*.
- 24 An end-point in a narrative does not necessarily mean an 'end': most serials want you to think that its characters will go on living *after* their end. A good example of

- this is the finale of *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine* ('What You Leave Behind', 7.25–6), which brings resolution to many of the serial's ongoing storylines, but which also points to future storylines (Chief O'Brien will return to Earth to teach at Starfleet Academy; Worf will become the Federation's ambassador to Qo'noS, etc.) that the show itself will never resolve (though these stories are often, like the *Iliad*'s own unresolved storylines, taken up in other media). For discussion of the *Iliad*'s ending, see Murnaghan, S. 'Equal honor and future glory: the plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*', in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, eds. Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, Don Fowler (Princeton University Press, 1997) 23–42; Troftgruben, T.M. *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts within its Literary Environment* (Mohr-Siebeck, 2010) 81–4.
- 25 We might assume that the *Iliad*'s audiences would have known its ending, creating a different viewership mode. See Scodel, R. 'Pseudo-Intimacy and Prior Knowledge of the Homeric Audience', *Arethusa* 30.2 (1997) 201–19. But even if *Iliad* audiences did know the ending, there is a clear parallel with today's 'spoiler' communities, who obsessively watch shows *knowing* what will happen next. We see this in the portion of *Game of Thrones* audience who have read the books (dubbed 'readers'), but also in more conventional serial audiences. For an exploration of this phenomenon, see Gray, J., and J. Mittell. 'Speculation on Spoilers: *Lost* Fandom, Narrative Consumption and Rethinking Textuality', *Particip@tions* 4.1 (2007) 1–46.
- 26 For how technology is changing viewership in terms of binge-watching, see Jenner, M. 'Is this TVIV? On Netflix, TVIII and binge-watching', *new media & society* (2014) 1–17. In Eleanor Turney's interview with Mike Pearson and Mike Brookes, the directors of the 'Marathon' eight-hour performance of Christopher Logue's *Iliad*, she compared the experience to 'box sets' and 'binge-watching'; Turney, E. 'The *Iliad*: "A Song You Don't Want to End"', *Exeunt Magazine*, 21 September 2015: <http://exeuntmagazine.com/features/the-iliad-a-song-you-dont-want-to-end/>
- 27 For the *Iliad* as a fore-runner of the serial television form, see Petersen, 'Den serielle fortælleform'; Dupont, F. *Homère et Dallas: Introduction à une critique anthropologique* (Hachette, 1991) gives an extended investigation of contrasts and commonalities between Homeric epic (particularly the *Odyssey*) and the 80s primetime soap *Dallas* (CBS, 1978–91). Sean O'Sullivan also likens serial television to 'verse narrative', with the *Odyssey* in particular as its forebearer, in the "'The Sopranos v. *Lost*": Sean O'Sullivan's opening statement on *The Sopranos*', *Project Narrative*, last modified June 10, 2008, <https://projectnarrative.wordpress.com/2008/06/10/the-sopranos-v-lost-sean-osullivans-opening-statement-on-the-sopranos/>; James Bowman in his discussion of the *Sopranos* also likened the show to 'Homeric epic' in 'Mob Hit', JamesBowman.net, last modified 1 May 2001, <http://www.jamesbowman.net/articleDetail.asp?pubID=1437>; Adam Gopnik talks about

- the contemporary appetite for the long-form television serial 'that would have shamed the Greeks as they listened to a bard recite in monotone the ancient epics of their race . . .' in 'A Point of View: How much longer can sprawling TV box sets get?', *BBC Magazine*, August 7, 2015, <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-33804184>
- 28 de Jong says, of using a narratological approach to the *Iliad*: 'it has been liberating to think in terms of a narrative rather than a poem, of a narrator and narratees rather than a singer and his public'. de Jong, I.J.F. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, 2nd edn (Duckworth, 1987), xiv.
- 29 See Bordwell, D. *Narration in the Fiction Film* (University of Wisconsin Press, 1985) and Mittell, *Complex TV*, 17–54, for 'historical' poetic approaches to film and television, respectively
- 30 Michael Z. Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs: Toward a Poetics of Television Narrative', *The Velvet Light Trap* 58 (2006) 16–28.
- 31 Most of twentieth-century scholarship on Homeric scholarship focused on whether or not an oral tradition could produce 'character' as we recognize it – see Collins, L. *Studies in Characterisation in the Iliad* (Athenäum-Verlag, 1988) 14–18, for a full account of character in the analyst/unitarian debate; even those who consider character present in the epics are wont to see them as static, largely typical (though they can individuated) and lacking 'innerness': Kirk, G.S. *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge University Press, 1962) 265; Silk, M. *Homer: The Iliad*, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, 2004) 74–5. Christopher Gill's exploration of the character-personality distinction sees 'character' correspond to typical or objective responses, where 'personality' corresponds to subjective or second-order objective responses, again drawing character largely according to ethical systems, and recognising that these two modes might overlap. Gill, C. 'The Character-Personality Distinction' in *Character and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. C.B.R. Pelling (Clarendon Press, 1990) 1–31. Collins pursues a system of characterization according to ethical types, Collins, L. *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad* (Athenaum, 1988); Zanker also approaches character through an ethical exploration of the values of cooperation and competition in *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad* (University of Michigan Press, 1996); James Phelan's view of literary character sees character as combining mimetic, thematic and synthetic elements, in *Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression and the Interpretation of Narrative* (University of Chicago Press, 1989); Ruth Scodel follows this model in her approach to ancient character in *Credible Impossibilities, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 122 (Teubner, 1999); see n. 2 for a bibliography on character.
- 32 Eder, J., Fotis Jannidis, and Ralf Schneider, 'Characters in Fictional Worlds: An Introduction', in *Characters in Fictional Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film and Other Media. Revisionen: Grundbegriffe der Literaturtheorie*

- 3, eds Jens Eder, Fotis Jannidis, and Ralf Schneider, (Walter De Gruyter Inc., 2010) 3–66, 7. In his recent work on character in the Ancient Greek novel, De Temmerman follows this definition: De Temmerman, K. *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*, (Oxford University Press, 2014), 6. In contrast, see Nancy Worman for a semiotic approach to ancient literary character. Worman, N. *The Cast of Character: Style in Ancient Literature* (University of Texas Press, 2002) 11.
- 33 Walter Donlan calls Hektor ‘an easily recognizable archetype’. Donlan, W. ‘Character Structure in Homer’s *Iliad*’, *Journal of General Education*, no. 21, vol. 4 (1970) 259–69, 266. I allow the possibility that Hektor is a type, if we allow that he is complex and dynamic, but I do not want to approach him *assuming* he is a type. For complexity within types, see Eder et al., *Characters in Fictional Worlds*, 39: ‘It is not the simplicity of a character, but the degree to which it agrees with established schemata which turns it into a type. Typified characters can also change, though they tend to change in a typical way . . .’
- 34 Eder et al., *Characters in Fictional Worlds*, 31.
- 35 For the Iliadic narrator as ‘cinematic’, see Tsagalis, C. ‘From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the *Iliad*’, (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2012); de Jong, I.J.F. and René Nünlist, ‘From Bird’s Eye View to Close Up: The Standpoint of the Narrator in the Homeric Epics’ in *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, eds Bierl, A. et al. (K. G. Saur, 2004); for cinematic techniques in Homer, see Bonifazi, A. ‘Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers’, in *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World, Orality an Literacy in Ancient Greece, Volume 7*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, (Brill, 2008) 35–64. For cinematic techniques more specifically in the *Iliad*’s battle sequences, see Latacz, J. *Kampffparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*, *Zetemata* 66 (Beck, 1977) esp. 77; see also Van Wees, H. ‘Homeric Warfare’, in *A New Companion to Homer*, eds Morris, I. and B. Powell (Brill, 1997) 668–93, 673–4.
- 36 Smith, M. *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion and the Cinema* (Oxford University Press, 1995), 75–86.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 82.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 145.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 142.
- 40 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 129. While alignment is close to narratology’s conception of ‘focalization’, it works more closely to Chatman’s ‘interest-focus’, which Scodel has applied to Homeric narrative. See Scodel, R. ‘Narrative Focus and Elusive Thought in Homer’, in *Defining Greek Narrative*, eds Douglas Cairns and Ruth Scodel (University of Edinburgh Press, 2014).
- 41 Hammer, D. ‘The *Iliad* as Ethical Thinking: Politics, Pity and the Operation of Esteem’, *Arethusa* 35.2 (2002) 203–35, 203, gives a good summary of major arguments against Homeric ‘innerness’. Griffin, *Homer On Life and Death*, 52,

- significantly claims that Homeric characters ‘can be seen to intend things which they do not explicitly reveal as their intention.’
- 42 Scholes, R. and R. Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (Oxford University Press, 1966) 180. For a discussion of the *Iliad*’s externalized inner monologues with respect to decision-making and ethical agency, see Sharples, R. W. “‘But Why has My Spirit Spoken with Me Thus?’: Homeric Decision-Making’, *Greece and Rome*, 30.1 (1983) 1–7.
- 43 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 130.
- 44 For the connection between external markers and character interiority in the *Iliad*, see Bernsdorff, H. *Zur Rolle des Aussehens im homerischen Menschenbild*, (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); for a survey of a wide range of external markers and social meaning in the *Iliad*, (including gestures, emotional expressions, physical markers and significant objects), see Lateiner, D. *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic* (University of Michigan Press, 1995). For what has to be the best, or perhaps just the funniest, analysis of the connection between character and external markers, with the example of *The Walking Dead*’s Rick Grimes and his facial hair, please see ‘*The Walking Dead*: The Many Faces of Rick Grimes – A Video Tribute’ by Dave Trumbore, 9 March, 2016: <http://collider.com/the-walking-dead-rick-grimes-tribute-video/>
- 45 See Griffin, J. ‘Homeric Words and Speakers’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986) 35–57.
- 46 Blakey Vermeule refers to this process through the cognitive concept of ‘mind reading’ characters in *Why do we care about literary characters?* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), see especially p. 34 for a definition. Suzanne Keen talks about character innerness in ‘psycho-narration’, like ancient epics, which ‘also gives readers access to the inner life of characters’ in ‘A Theory of Narrative Empathy’, *Narrative*, no. 14, vol. 3 (2006) 207–36, 220. For ‘mind reading’ in the *Iliad*, see Scodel, R. ‘ἦ and Theory of Mind in the *Iliad*’ in *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, ed. M. Meier-Brügger (De Gruyter, 2012) 315–30.
- 47 Cf. Minchin, E. ‘Describing and Narrating in Homer’s *Iliad*’, in *Signs of Orality*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 188 (Brill, 1999) 48–64, 60–1.
- 48 We can see this dynamic in de Jong’s discussion of the narratees having more knowledge than the characters: ‘Homer’ in *Time*, 25.
- 49 Smith, *Engaging Characters*, 166–73.
- 50 These gaps in knowledge prompt Scodel’s ‘gap management’ by the audience; see ‘Narrative Focus’, 65–74; Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 13. For filling in gaps around character motivation, cf. de Jong, I.J.F. ‘Between word and deed: hidden thoughts in the *Odyssey*’, in *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, eds I.J.F. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 130 (Brill, 1994) 27–50, 29–30.

- 51 Smith, *Engaging Characters*, 153.
- 52 See Williams, L. *On the Wire* (Duke University Press, 2014); Mittell, *Complex TV*, esp. 233–60; Kackman, M. ‘Quality Television, Melodrama, and Cultural Complexity’, *Flow*, last modified March 5, 2010, <http://flowtv.org/2010/03/flow-favorites-quality-television-melodrama-and-cultural-complexity-michael-kackman-university-of-texas-austin/>
- 53 For parallels between television serials, melodrama, and myth, see Lozano, E. ‘The Force of Myth on Popular Narratives: The Case of Melodramatic Serials’ *Communication Theory*, 2.3 (1992) 207–20.
- 54 Smith, *Engaging Characters*, 167.
- 55 Newman, ‘From Beats to Arcs’, 17–20.
- 56 This television-based definition contrasts with that of Edwards, M.W. *Sense, Sound and Rhythm: Listening to Greek and Latin Poetry* (Princeton University Press, 2004) and Richardson, S. *The Homeric Narrator* (Vanderbilt University Press, 1990), who define scenes according to an equal weight given to narrative and action: when we consider scene in television terms, it *includes* the kind of ‘summary’ that Edwards refers to. This distinction between beats and scenes also helps with the ‘scene change’ problem of Leukothea’s finding Odysseus on the sea at *Od.* 5.315–20, which does not indicate a scene change, but rather a new beat. See Edwards, *Sense, Sound and Rhythm*, 49.
- 57 Epstein, A. *Crafty TV Writing: Thinking Inside The Box* (Holt Paperbacks, 2006), 77–9.
- 58 See O’Sullivan, ‘Broken on Purpose’, 59–77, for a discussion of the necessarily fragmented nature of serial narratives, which O’Sullivan likens to poetic stanzas.
- 59 Newman, ‘From Beats to Arcs’, 17.
- 60 Reichel, M. ‘Retardationstechniken in der *Ilias*’ in *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990) 125–52, 145 describes this rapid switching between plot lines as ‘homerische Retardationstechnik’, which engages audience members who like the tension left by dangling storylines as the narrative switches between them.
- 61 *Daredevil* (Netflix, 2015–), Season 2, Episode 3.
- 62 This contrasts with Reichel, ‘Retardationstechniken’, 149, who finds an average of a ‘scene-change’ involving either character or place every 70 lines, which would make performance beats average around five minutes.
- 63 The importance of every beat to audience experience, particularly in creating character allegiance, leads me to put aside any kind of beat hierarchy between ‘kernels’ and ‘satellites’, which Chatman distinguished between to show that ‘kernels’ move the plot forward, while ‘satellites’ serve other, often character-based, functions. For a full discussion, see Chatman, S. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Cornell, 1978), esp. 56–9. For kernels and satellites in television, see

- Porter, M.J., Larson, D.L., Harthcock, A. and K. B. Nellis, 'Re(de)fining Narrative Events: Examining Television Narrative Structure', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 30.1 (2002) 23–30. For kernels and 'catalysts' in the *Iliad*, see Clark, M. 'The Concept of Plot and Plot in the *Iliad*', *Phoenix* 55.1–2 (2001) 1–8.
- 64 *Ibid.*, 18.
- 65 For a breakdown of epithets as Homeric trait-attributes, see Passakos, C.G. and Boele de Raad, 'Ancient personality: Trait attributions to characters in Homer's *Iliad*', *Ancient Narrative*, no. 7 (2009) 75–96; cf. Nagy, G. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*, (Cornell University Press, 1990) 23: 'A distinctive epithet is like a small theme song that conjures up a thought-association with the traditional essence of an epic figure, thing, or concept.'
- 66 Many scholars have mentioned repetition as a key element of the oral epics: Clark, M. 'Formula, Metre, and Type-Scenes', in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. R. Fowler (Cambridge University Press, 2004) 117–138, esp. 117–119; Schein, S. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (University of California Press, 1984) 1; Taplin, O. *Homeric Soundings*, 9; Louden, *The Iliad: Structure, Myth and Meaning*, 1. Repetition is not, however, unique to oral poetry, and nor can it be considered to be, as Schein says, 'naïve'; *The Mortal Hero*, 1. It is, rather, a necessary aspect of all serial forms of fictions, especially the non-literate medium of television, but also in comics, serial novels, and even, to a lesser extent, of the novel itself as a long-form narrative that requires many sittings to get through. See Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 16–28, 18–19; Eco, U. 'Innovation and Repetition Between Modern and Post-Modern Aesthetics', *Daedalus*, 114.4 (1985) 161–184, 166; O'Sullivan, S. 'Old, New, Borrowed, Blue: Deadwood and Serial Fiction' in *Reading Deadwood: A Western to Swear By* (Tauris, 2006) 115–29; Miller, J.H. *Fiction and Repetition: Seven English Novels* (Harvard University Press, 1985) 1; Plotz, 'Serial Pleasures', see especially paragraphs 10, 13, and 19.
- 67 For a comprehensive overview of Hektor's epithets, see Sacks, R. *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning and Interpretation* (Brill, 1987) 105–51.
- 68 Repetition augments readers' abilities for narrative recall, even when story structures are repeated with different characters. See Thorndyke, P.W. 'Cognitive Structures in Comprehension and Narrative Discourse', *Cognitive Psychology*, 9 (1977) 357–60.
- 69 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 181; cf. Scodel, 'Pseudo-Intimacy', 211.
- 70 Cf. 'internal analepses' in de Jong. *Narrators and Focalizers*, 82–5, 208; cf. Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 62–77.
- 71 Cf. 'history' in Minchin, 'Describing and Narrating'; see also 'external analepses' in de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 89–90, 155–7.
- 72 For work on foreshadowing in the *Iliad*, see Garcia, L. F. Jr. *Homeric Durability: Telling Time in the Iliad* (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013) 119 n. 46; cf. 'prolepses' in

- de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 81–90; for foreshadowing and misdirection, see Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*.
- 73 Cf. ‘internal actorial prolepsis’, or ‘plan’; de Jong, ‘Homer’, 26.
- 74 Cf. ‘instructions’: ‘Passages between instruction and relay are usually brief, with a description of the departure, journey, and meeting between the relaying character and the instruction’s final object. The poet may also, however, interpose another episode or series of episodes, allowing the relay to be employed as a binding technique for wildly disparate events.’ in Kelly, A. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Iliad VIII*, (Oxford, 2007) 325.
- 75 See de Jong, *Narrators*, 81–90, for a summary of Homeric *analepses* and *prolepses*; see additional analysis with respect to plot and character in de Jong, ‘Homer’ in *Time in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek narrative, Volume 2*, eds I.J.F. de Jong and René Nünlist, (Brill, 2007), 17–37.
- 76 Cf. Schadewaldt’s *ungenauigkeit*, or ‘insufficiency’; Schadewaldt, W. *Iliasstudien*, 3rd edn (Darmstadt, 1966) 140.
- 77 See Morrison, J. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad* (University of Michigan Press, 1992) for a full discussion of Iliadic predictions or foreshadowings that do not come to pass; cf. Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 77–83; Grethlein, J. *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias: Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive, Hypomnemata* 163 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006) esp. 207–40.
- 78 Morrison, J., *Homeric Misdirection*, 21–2, makes the fine point that foreshadowing and misdirection force shifts in audience alignment, away from the omniscience of the gods ‘into a situation experienced by mortal characters . . . characterized by doubt, delay, frustration, and false expectation’.
- 79 Adams, E. ‘Game Of Thrones (newbies): “Hardhome”’, *A. V. Club*, 31 May 2015, <http://www.avclub.com/tvclub/game-thrones-newbies-hardhome-220153>
- 80 In Richardson’s discussion of scene changes, he responds to one of his own examples by saying ‘Scene changes such as the one above can be considered no changes at all but a revelation that we are sharing our viewpoint with one of the characters’, *Homeric Narrator*, 112. This ‘revelation’ comes from the narrator switching our alignment to that of another character, which usually signifies a beat switch.
- 81 *Ibid.*, 109–19.
- 82 As with scenes, this definition of ‘episode’ stands in contrast with that of Edwards, who defines an episode as ‘a continuous action (including both “scenes” and “summaries” in the narratological sense), usually taking place in one location and involving (mainly) the same character’, *Sound, Sense*, 49–50. What Edwards defines as an ‘episode’, I define with the television term ‘sequence’.
- 83 The last season of *Sons of Anarchy* flaunted this convention, with many of its episodes running well over its traditional run-time. Media outlets had a field day with this,

- running headlines like Alasdair Wilkins' *Sons of Anarchy* series finale begins tonight, might end sometime this week', *A. V. Club*, 9 December 2014, <http://www.avclub.com/article/sons-of-anarchy-series-finale-begins-tonight-might-en-212767>; or Amber Dowling's article, 'Why *Sons of Anarchy's* Excruciating Long Episodes are Ruining the Show', *Indiewire*, 11 November 2014, <http://www.indiewire.com/article/why-sons-of-anarchy-excruciatingly-long-episodes-are-ruining-the-show-20141111>
- 84 C.K., Louis, e-mail to fans, April 16, 2016.
- 85 Cf. the discussion of the Homeric poems as 'additive' oral poetry in Bakker, E.J. 'How Oral is Oral Composition?' in *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. E. Mackay, *Mnemosyne* Supplement 188 (1999) 29–48, especially 41–3.
- 86 For a comprehensive bibliography of work on the Homeric book divisions, see Heiden, B. 'The Placement of Book Divisions in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118 (1998) 68–81, 68 n. 2.
- 87 Cf. Whitman, C. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, (Harvard, 1958); Jensen, M.S. 'Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* divided into Songs?' *Symbolae Osloenses* 74.1 (1999) 5–91; Heiden, 'Book Divisions', 68–81.
- 88 Cf. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 27; though I would disagree with Taplin's assessment that breaks would be so short (five to fifteen minutes) or come so infrequently (every few hours). Edwards, *Sound, Sense*, 43 makes the important point that 'The book divisions are merely a few among the many similar breaks in the poems', suggesting that breaks may be taken nearly anywhere: finally, Edwards concludes that '... in actuality there are no narrative breaks within the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', 58.
- 89 For this tension between aperture and closure in the storyline of Zeus's plan in the *Iliad*, see Murnaghan, 'Equal Honor and Future Glory: The Plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*'. Heiden, 'Book Divisions', 75, asserts that '... the marking of "books" in the *Iliad* is seldom accompanied by the satisfying sense of *closure* that some critics have found natural to seek in them'.
- 90 Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 20; cf. Heiden, 'Three movements', 10–11.
- 91 *Alias* actually dropped this technique of cliffhangers ending every episode, due to network concerns that new viewers would be confused. This caused complaints in the blogosphere: 'These cliffhangers have kept us moving from episode to episode, season to season with certain expectations. We expect to be stunned, shocked and shaken by turn-on-the-dime plot twists and character revelations. We expect to gasp, grunt and grumble as writers leave us begging for more information, one more scene, or a single last clue. Starting in season 4, *Alias* began wrapping their episodes up into pretty little packages, solving a case-worth of issues in one forty-minute episode. Wham bam—conflict and resolution in the time it takes to wash a load of whites.' Girlscout, 'Cliffhangers Let Loose', *Let's Talk Alias*, November 5, 2005, <http://letstalkalias.blogspot.ca/2005/11/cliffhangers-let-loose.html>

- 92 For a good discussion of these irregular narrative strategies of *The Good Wife*, see Sonia Saraiya's article, 'Previously, on *The Good Wife* . . . 10 episodes to catch you up for season 6', *A. V. Club*, 16 July, 2014: <http://www.avclub.com/article/previously-good-wife-10-episodes-catch-you-season--206651>
- 93 Cf. Nimis, S. 'Oral and Written Forms in Closure in the Ancient Novel' in *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. C.J. Mackie, (Brill, 2002) 182.
- 94 See Heiden, 'Book Divisions', 70 for a list of beats before and after each book division; cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 249–68, for a complete breakdown of the transitions over book divisions, including notes of 'retrospective' beginnings of books. This approach does not allow that a recap of a previous 'episode' can actually come much later in the present episode than at the beginning, as the *in media res* beginnings of *The Good Wife*'s serial narrative show.
- 95 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 130.
- 96 Ibid.
- 97 For a discussion of the deaths of minor characters in the *Iliad*, see Ciani, M.G. 'Le morti minori nell'Iliade', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 122 (1963–4) 403–15.
- 98 For a definition of this TV trope, see TV Tropes, 'Red Shirt', *TVTropes.org*, <http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/Red-shirt>. For conflicting in-depth statistical analyses of the safety of the *Star Trek* red-shirt, see Bailey, M. 'Analytics According to Captain Kirk', *Site Logic Marketing*, last modified January 4, 2008, <http://www.sitelogicmarketing.com/analytics-according-to-captain-kirk/> and Barsalou, M. 'Keep your red-shirt on: a Bayesian exploration', *Significance*, February 19, 2013, <https://www.statslife.org.uk/culture/458-keep-your-red-shirt-on-star-trek-a-bayesian-exploration>
- 99 Cf. Mueller, M. *The Iliad*, 2nd edn (A & C Black, 2013) 83.
- 100 Smith, Anthony J. 'TV or Not TV? *The Sopranos* and Contemporary Episode Architecture in US Network and Premium Cable Drama', *Critical Studies in Television*, 6.1 (2011) 36–51, 44.
- 101 Ibid.
- 102 Ibid., 46.
- 103 Cf. de Romilly, J. *Hector* (Le Livre de Poche, 1997), 10; Redfield, J. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector* (Duke University Press, 1975), 109.
- 104 Smith, 'TV or not TV?', 44.
- 105 Allen, R. C. 'Making Sense of Soaps', in *The Television Studies Reader*, eds R. C. Hill and Annette Hill (Routledge, 2004), 251.
- 106 Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 16.
- 107 Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 23.
- 108 Image appears courtesy of Santiago Ortiz, Moebio Labs, 'The Iliad', *Moebio.com*, <http://moebio.com/iliad/>

- 109 Some of this dynamic, in the long-distance connections between individual plot points within a story-arc, is discussed in Reichel, M. *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (Gunter Narr Verlag, 1994).
- 110 Achilles is mentioned by name at 2.875, 4.512, 5.788, 6.99, 6.414, 6.423, 7.113, 7.228, 8.225, 8.372, 9.107, 9.164, 9.166.
- 111 Porter et al., 'Re(de)fining Narrative Events: Examining Television Narrative Structure', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 30.1 (2002) 24.
- 112 Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 23.
- 113 Fiske, J. *Television Culture* (Taylor and Francis, 2002) 120–1.
- 114 de Jong, 'Homer' in *Time*, 21.
- 115 Summing up his appraisal of Homeric characterization, Michael Silk says 'Perhaps the most alien feature of Homer's people is that, in general, they seem to show no capacity for development: character is conceived as static.' *The Iliad*, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 75.
- 116 Pearson, R. 'Anatomising Gilbert Grissom: The Structure and Function of the Televisual Character', in *Reading CSI: Crime TV Under the Microscope*, ed. Michael Allen (Tauris, 2007), 39–56, 56.
- 117 Örnebring, H. 'The Show Must Go On . . . And On: Narrative and Seriality in *Alias*', in *Investigating Alias: Secrets and Spies*, ed. S. Abbot and S. Brown (Tauris, 2007), 11–26, 25.
- 118 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 136.
- 119 Newman, 'From Beats to Arcs', 23.
- 120 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 134.
- 121 *Game of Thrones* (HBO 2011–), Season 4, Episode 1.
- 122 Other character evidence also points to this change in Achilles, as Andromache reports that Achilles ransomed her mother alive (6.425–7), and Hekabe speaks of Achilles having ransomed her other sons alive in the past (24.751–3).
- 123 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 134.
- 124 *Ibid.*, 138
- 125 This kind of overhaul during an *aristeia* is like the 'possession' discussed in Collins, D. (1998) *Immortal Armor: The Concept of Alkē in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, esp. 15–45.
- 126 As quoted by John Plunkett, 'Breaking Bad creator Vince Gilligan: "How long can anyone stay at the top?"', *The Guardian*, 18 August 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/aug/18/breaking-bad-vince-gilligan-walter-white>
- 127 *Ibid.*
- 128 *Ibid.*
- 129 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 156.
- 130 Schemas can apply to both narrative patterns as well as character categorization. For schemas, or 'scripts' in Homeric composition, see Minchin, E. 'Scripts and

- Themes: Cognitive Research and Homeric Epic', *Classical Antiquity*, 11.2 (1992) 229–41. Minchin gives an excellent definition of scripts in her later book, *Homer and the Resources of Memory*, 13: '[schemata represent] knowledge and experience, not definitions; they include a fixed core of routine actions or events along with a variable aspect; they are active recognition devices which allow us to reconstruct narrative.'
- 131 Miall, D.S. 'Affect and Narrative', *Poetics* 17 (1988) 259–72, 261.
- 132 Fiske, S.T., M. Lin and Steven L. Neuberg, 'The Continuum Model: Ten Years Later' in *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology*, eds S. Chaiken and Y. Trope (Guildford Press, 1999) 231–54. See also Culpepper, J. 'Reflections on a stylistic approach to characterization' in *Cognitive Poetics: goals, gains, gaps*, eds G. Brône and J. Vandele (Walter de Gruyter, 2009) 125–59, esp. 135–9.
- 133 We can compare this to Uri Margolin's idea of character, which coalesces through a series of processes but only ends once the text is done: 'Character-building consists of a succession of individual operations of characterization, together with second order activities of continual patterning and re-patterning of the traits obtained in the first order operations, until a fairly coherent constellation or trait paradigm can be arrived at. The final character portrait of any NA [narrative agent] can be formulated only once we have read the whole text. It is a static model, a paradigmatic, retrospective cluster of enduring traits.' in 'The Doer and the Deed: Action as a Basis for Characterization in Narrative', *Poetics Today* 7.2 (1986) 205–25, 205–6.
- 134 See Minchin, E. "'Themes" and "Mental Moulds": Roger Schank, Malcolm Willcock and The Creation of Character in Homer', *Classical Quarterly* 61 (2011) 323–43, for an argument for a schema-based understanding of character in Homer.
- 135 Hampson, S.E. 'Determinants of Inconsistent Personality Descriptions: Trait and Target Effects', *Journal of Personality* 65.2 (1997) 249–89, 249.
- 136 Scodel, R. *Credible Impossibilities: Conventions and Strategies of Verisimilitude on Homer and Greek Tragedy* (Teubner, 1999) 3.
- 137 Donlan, 'Character', 266–7.
- 138 For a solid collection of Hektor's 'heroic' traits, see Bile, M. and J. Klein, 'Hector et les principaux personnages féminins de l'*Iliade*', *Gaia* 11 (2007) 121–7, 122.
- 139 For Hektor's reputation in contrast to his actual skills as a fighter, see Farron, S. 'The Character of Hector in the *Iliad*', *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 39–57, esp. 39–40; cf. Mackie, *Talking Trojan*, 124–5; Quaglia, L. 'La Figura di Ettore e l'etica dell'*Iliade*', *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 94, 1959–60, Torino (1960) 1–81, 5.
- 140 For Hektor as an Aristotelian tragic figure who errs, see Redfield, *Nature and Culture*, 128–59; cf. Mueller, M. 'Knowledge and Delusion in the *Iliad*', *Mosaic* 3.2 (1970) 96.
- 141 See Fineberg, S. 'Blind Rage and Eccentric Vision in *Iliad* 6', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999) 13–41, esp. 31–4, for a discussion of Hektor's relationship with rage.

- 142 Bernadete, S. *Achilles and Hector: The Homeric Hero* (St. Augustine's Press, 2005) 121.
- 143 Farron, 'Character of Hector', argues that Hektor is essentially a gentle family man who is forced to fight.
- 144 See Mueller, 'Knowledge and Delusion', 90–6.
- 145 de Romilly, J. *Hector*, Éditions de Fallois, Paris (1997) 21: 'Je le trouvais beau, magnifique, héroïque . . .' de Romilly is probably the most positive in her assessment about Hektor.
- 146 For an exploration of Hektor's fraught masculinity, see Van Nortwick, T. 'Like a Woman: Hector and the Boundaries of Masculinity', *Arethusa* 34.2 (2001) 221–35.
- 147 For a brief discussion of the narrator's treatment of Hektor as feminine, see Hill, D.E. 'Iliad 22.191', *Hermes* 99.3 (1971) 372–4. For the Trojans as somehow more 'feminine' than the Achaeans, Hektor among them, see Mackie, *Talking Trojan*, esp. 81–2, and 137–8.
- 148 Donlan, 'Character', 266, says that Hektor is 'an easily recognizable archetype'.
- 149 Ibid. also claims that Hektor (along with Achilles and Agamemnon) is a 'character as a true personality'.
- 150 For an argument that 'Homer' invented Hektor as a more appropriate antagonist than Paris, see Scott, J.A. 'Paris and Hector in Tradition and in Homer', *Classical Philology* 8.2 (1913) 160–71; for a counter-argument, see Combellack, F. 'Homer and Hector', *American Journal of Philology* 65.3 (1944) 209–43.
- 151 Traill, D. 'Unfair to Hector?' *Classical Philology* 85.4 (1990) 299–303, 303.
- 152 For trait-based character experience, see Margolin, U. 'Structuralist approaches to character in narrative', *Semiotica*. 75.1–2 (1989) 1–24, 17; Chatman, S. *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca, 1978) 118–19; Rapp, D.N. and R.J. Grigg, 'Readers' Trait-Based Models of Characters in Narrative Comprehension', *Journal of Memory and Language* 45 (2001) 737–50, 748; Pearson, 'Anatomising Gilbert Grissom', 43, expands on Bordwell's 'traits, physical behaviour and speech as constituting a character', to consist instead of 'psychological traits/habitual behaviours; physical characteristics/appearance; speech patterns; interactions with other characters; environment; and biography'; Minchin, 'Mental Moulds', looks at Iliadic characters through the lens of 'themes, goals, and plans'.
- 153 Twombly, C. *Fifty Days at Iliam: Shades of Achilles, Patroclus and Hector*, 1978, Philadelphia Museum of Fine Art.
- 154 Cf. Heiden, 'Book Divisions', 80.
- 155 For discussions of parasocial relationships with characters in serial narratives, see Tian, Q. and C.A. Hoffner, 'Parasocial interaction with liked, neutral, and disliked characters on a popular TV series', *Mass Communication and Society* 3.3 (2010) 250–69; Madison, T.P. and L.V. Porter, 'The People We Meet: Discriminating Functions of Parasocial Interactions', *Imagination, Cognition and Personality: Consciousness in Theory, Research, and Clinical Practice* 35.1 (2015) 47–71.

156 Martin, G.R.R. as interviewed by Adrià Guxens, ‘George R.R. Martin: “Trying to please everyone is a horrible mistake’, *Adria’s News*, 7 October 2012. <http://www.adriasnews.com/2012/10/george-r-r-martin-interview.html?spref=tw>

Chapter 1: Enter Hektor

- 1 For the ludic pleasures of serial television, see Shroder, K.C. ‘The Pleasure of *Dynasty*’ in *Television and Its Audience*, eds Drummond, P. and R. Paterson, (British Film Institute: 1988); cf. Gray and Mittell, ‘Speculation on Spoilers’.
- 2 See Scodel, R. ‘Pseudo-Intimacy’; the proem of 1.1–8 also serves this purpose.
- 3 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 118.
- 4 Rated among the ‘12 Most Epic Character Introductions In TV History’ by *whatculture*: <http://whatculture.com/tv/12-epic-character-introductions-tv-history.php/6>
- 5 For a discussion of Negan’s traditional significance, and why it matters for *The Walking Dead* television series, see Abad-Santos, A. ‘Negan has finally arrived on The Walking Dead. Here’s why he’s so important.’ *vox.com*, 3 April, 2016: <http://www.vox.com/2016/4/3/11353504/walking-dead-negan>
- 6 Cf. Redfield, *Nature and Culture*, 109; Hektor is *never* a ‘minor character’: contra. Farron, ‘Character of Hector’, 41.
- 7 For the introductions of various characters and prior audience knowledge in this ‘episode’, see Scodel, ‘Pseudo-Intimacy’, 207–8.
- 8 For a full analysis of character movement and space in *Iliad* 1, see Minchin, E. ‘Spatial Memory and the Composition of the *Iliad*’, in Mackay, *Orality, Literacy, Memory*, 9–34.
- 9 See Introduction, p. 8 for ‘missions’.
- 10 See Wyatt, W. ‘Homer in Performance: *Iliad* 1.348–427’, *Classical Journal* 83.4 (1988) 289–97. While Wyatt does not go so far as to suggest an episode break here, he does posit that Achilles’ recap of the whole Chryseis episode is due to performance needs, particularly in aligning the audience with Achilles as the plot moves forward.
- 11 de Jong, I.J.F. ‘*Iliad* 1.366–92: A Mirror Story’, *Arethusa* 18.1 (1985) 5–22. de Jong draws attention to this line as Achilles’ ‘comment on the repetitious character of his story’ (11). She refers to this recap as a ‘mirror story’ that allows us insight into Achilles’ mental state, and is consistent with oral composition in how repetitive it is.
- 12 For discussion of the delay in Thetis’s mission to Zeus, see Scodel, R. ‘The Gods’ Visit to the Ethiopians in *Iliad* 1’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103 (2007) 83–98.
- 13 The only other time that this formula, χιτώνα περι στήθεσσι δαΐζει, appears, is at 16.841, where Hektor, speaking to the dying Patroklos, imagines that this is what Patroklos has intended to do to him.

- 14 For a good survey of scholarship on Homeric catalogues, see Sammons, B. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford (2010) 5–8.
- 15 Gaertner is very helpful here on the main functions of the catalogue: ‘(1) to describe characters of the plot, (2) to intensify the presentation of events, (3) to foreshadow future events and create suspense, (4) and to provoke or increase the reader’s emotional involvement in the narrative.’ in Gaertner, J.F. ‘The Homeric Catalogues and Their Function in Epic Narrative’, *Hermes* 129.3 (2001) 298–305, 300.
- 16 For the traditional debate that Hektor was Protesilaos’s killer, see Burgess, *Tradition*, 64. Cf. Proclus’s epitome of the *Cypria*; Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30; Sophocles fr. 497 Radt.
- 17 For a discussion of the significance of this elaboration on the catalogue’s first invocation, and how it recaps Achilles’ absence, see Heiden, B. ‘Common People and Leaders in *Iliad* Book 2: The Invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138 (2008) 127–54, esp. 137; see also Minchin, E. ‘The Poet Appeals to His Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance’, *Classical Journal* 91.1 (1995), 25–33, 28 n 13.
- 18 For ‘retardation’ through these beats, see Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 41–3.
- 19 Cf. ‘presence’ through apostrophe in Bakker, E. ‘Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization, and “Presence” in Homeric Poetry’, *Classical Antiquity*, 12.1 (1993) 1–29, 25.
- 20 For ‘with the gleaming helmet’ as an echoed epithet for Hektor, see Yamagata, N. ‘Epithets with Echoes: a Study on Formula-Narrative Interaction’, in *Homeric Contexts*, 445–68, 450.
- 21 Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 23.
- 22 We encounter those who *have* died in the Achaian list: Oineus and his sons and Meleagros (2.640–2); Tlepolemos’ murder of his uncle at 2.662; but the first hint of Trojan violence comes at 2.699–703, where we learn of Protesilaos’ death at the hands of a Dardanian as he leapt onto the Trojan beach.
- 23 See Introduction: a ‘red-shirt’ is a minor character who is often only introduced to die; the term derives from the original *Star Trek* series (NBC, 1966–1999), where the majority of the characters who were introduced to die wore red shirts, the uniform of security and engineering personnel.
- 24 None of these names are mentioned with Achilles’ slaughter of the Trojans and their allies in Book 21; their mention here looks forward to that event, but are not fully resolved; cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 58.
- 25 See Marks, J. ‘Ἀρχοὺς αὖ νεῶν ἐπέω: A Programmatic Function of the Iliadic Catalogue of the Ships’, in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds), *Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, (2012) 101–112, Walter de Gruyter, for a discussion of catalogue pairings or clusters and later significance in the epic; for

- a discussion of the significance of Sarpedon and Glaukos in these lines in relation to their greater roles in the epic, see Crossett, J. ‘The Art of Homer’s Catalogue of Ships,’ *Classical Journal* 64.4, (1969) 241–5, 245.
- 26 For Paris as the ‘original’ antagonist of the Troy story, see Scott, J.A. ‘Paris and Hector in Tradition and in Homer,’ *Classical Philology* 8.2 (1913) 160–71, and ‘Homer and Hector’ *American Journal of Philology* 66.2 (1945) 187–9.
- 27 For a discussion of the significance of ‘moments,’ particularly in the context of character, see Hills, M. ‘The dispersible television text: theorizing moments of the new Doctor Who,’ *Science Fiction Film and Television*, 1.1 (2008) 25–44.
- 28 For discussions of this vocative, see Suter, A. ‘Paris and Dionysos: Iambos in the *Iliad*,’ *Arethusa* 26 (1993) 1–18; de Jong, I.J.F. ‘Paris/ Alexandros in the *Iliad*,’ *Mnemosyne* 60 (1987) 124–7, and Lloyd, M. ‘Paris/ Alexandros in Homer and Euripides,’ *Mnemosyne* 62 (1989) 76–8. All three articles make mention of Hektor’s exclusive use of this vocative form, but none of them posit a specific reason or special significance about this usage. See Brown, H.P. ‘The Pragmatics of Direct Address in the *Iliad*: A Study in Linguistic Politeness,’ Ohio State Dissertation (2003) 42: ‘when Hektor addresses his brother Paris as Δύσπαρι (G.39), he not only signals his identity: “Paris”, but Hektor’s feelings about him: “Paris you asshole”’. Brown goes on to say that when Hektor makes this type of address, he ‘makes immediately manifest their take on the relationship existing between themselves and those they have thus addressed; in fact, they serve to construct those relationships,’ 192.
- 29 Cf. Suter, A., ‘Paris and Dionysos,’ 3 n. 4. Hektor receives this same insult at 17.142.
- 30 Repeated at 13.769.
- 31 The last portrait of Hektor was Agamemnon’s, which fantasized about killing him with the sharp bronze: this image of Hektor *as* sharp bronze might bring that image to mind. For a full discussion of Paris’s response and relevant bibliography, see Krieter-Spiro, M. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar* (Band III- 3. Gesang), (eds) A. Bierl and J. Latacz, de Gruyter (2009), ad loc.
- 32 For the misdirection of the audience through the duel scene, see Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 54–63.
- 33 This epithet is distinctive to Hektor and only appears in the nominative; cf. Sacks, *Traditional Phrase*, 108.
- 34 This would fall under Richardson’s fourth category of scene-switches, moving from an event to a character whom it affects but is not aware that it happened; see Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 119. For an excellent analysis of this scene change and the opportunities that it allows ‘Homer’ (against claims of time-filling), see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 31–2.
- 35 Cf. Bowra, C.M. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. (Oxford, 1930) 112; cf. Priam looking for Lykaon and Polydoros at 22.46–54.

- 36 For an excellent exploration of this emotional response in epic and tragedy, see Cairns, D. (2015), ‘The Horror and the Pity: *Phrikē* as a Tragic Emotion’, *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 35.1 (2015) 75–94.
- 37 For a full discussion of ‘anonymous’ speeches in the *Iliad*, see de Jong, ‘The Voice of Anonymity: τις-Speeches’ in the *Iliad*, *Eranos* 85 (1987) 69–84.
- 38 Armstrong, ‘Arming Motif’, 343.
- 39 For this scene switch, see Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 116–7.
- 40 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 288, suggests that 3.447/8 might make a better break: I like that as a possible break as well.
- 41 Cf. 24.25–30 for specific reference to the ‘Judgement of Paris’; see Burgess, *Tradition*, 209 n. 3 for a discussion of those lines’ authenticity.
- 42 Cf. Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 4, on the ‘slow-motion’ piercing of Menelaos’s thigh, just a moment later. Also, cf. Rengakos, ‘Spannungstrageien’, 313–5, and 313 n 28 for slowing down the narrative as a strategy to increase audience tension.
- 43 Cf. Kirk, G.S. *The Iliad: Commentary: Volume I, Books 1–4* (Cambridge, 1985) ad loc.; 343.
- 44 de Jong, *Narrators*, 125, says that 4.141–7 is a place where the narrator (what de Jong calls the NeFe₁) knows that Pandaros’s shot is not fatal, which Menelaos does not. But the fact that the narrator tells Menelaos about the arrow being brushed aside at 4.127–9 makes everything about his calm response more plausible, rupturing in a real way the barrier between the performer and their characters. I have performed this scene, and surprised myself by addressing the entire following simile of Athena’s brushing aside the arrow to an imaginary Menelaos (4.130–3), and in that moment, I could actually imagine a satisfied Menelaos looking back at me in relief. It sounds cheesy, but that is what happened. For Athena as a mother here, see Pratt, L., ‘The Parental Ethos in the *Iliad*’, *Hesperia Supplements* 41: *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (2002) 32.
- 45 This follows on Nestor’s pre-oath exhortation to the Achaians who want to leave Troy, in Book 2, where he tells them: ‘let no man rush home/ until he has slept with the wife of a Trojan’ (τὼ μὴ τις πρὶν ἐπειγέσθω οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι/ πρὶν τινα παρ Τρώων ἀλόχῳ κατακοιμηθῆναι, 2.354).
- 46 Pratt, ‘Parental Ethos’, 31, places this simile under ‘feeding’, but the sheep only *hear* their lambs (ἀκούουσαι, 4.435).
- 47 See Kirk, *Commentary*, ad loc., 386. I might also suggest that Antilochos’s sudden introduction into the action, without his patronymic, makes a good case for his prior presence in tradition, as he does not appear again until 5.565 (there, as the son of Nestor), nearly an hour later in performance time. On the other hand, some serial narratives certainly introduce characters in brief scenes who only later become major characters. Think of Jaqen H’ghar in *Game of Thrones*, who makes his first, brief appearance in the second episode of the second season, where he only gives his

- name and the city that he is from: it is only in later episodes that Jaqen becomes a major character (particularly in the fifth and sixth seasons). We might also consider the phenomenon of ‘break-out characters’, like Mellie Grant in *Scandal* (ABC, 2012–) or Benjamin Linus in *Lost* (ABC, 2004–10), who were meant to be minor characters with few appearances, but became main cast members. This kind of character development speaks to the growing popularity of a character, which might be suggestive in thinking about the *Iliad*’s composition in response to ‘fans’.
- 48 See Fenik, B. *Typical Battle-Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description* (Wiesbaden, 1968) 10, for this kind of ‘chain-reaction’ battle sequence.
- 49 Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 9, claims here that ‘although the battle has been underway for some one hundred and twenty lines, the action enters a new phase with the appearance of Diomedes.’
- 50 See Mittell, *Complex TV*, 138–9; Introduction p. 17–8
- 51 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 111.
- 52 For irony and its affect on the audience in this scene (but not related to Pandaros’s family), see Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 103–9, esp. 108–9; for irony and audience anticipation more generally in epic, particularly in the *Odyssey*, see Rengakos, ‘Spannungstrageien’, 323–4.
- 53 Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, 31, claim that ‘women compromise a man’s valour and impair his ability to fight’.
- 54 See Edwards, *Sense, Sound*, 57, for this kind of scene change, where ‘usually at least one of the two characters has been mentioned recently’.
- 55 Beat change through aligning with a new character; cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 112.
- 56 Cf. ‘character’s entry at a moment of crisis’ in Scodel and Whitman, ‘Sequene and Simultaneity’, 4.
- 57 See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 68, for what he terms a ‘slaying catalogue’.
- 58 For a full discussion of this kind of ‘pivotal contrafactual’, see Loudon, B. ‘Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic’, *Classical Antiquity* 12.2 (1993) 181–98.
- 59 For Hektor’s shining helmet as a distinguishing element, see Yamagata, N. ‘Clothing and Identity in Homer: The Case of Penelope’s Web’, *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 58.4 (2005) 539–46, 539.
- 60 Cf. Kirk, *Commentary*, ad loc., 127.
- 61 Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 75–86 breaks down Book 5 into several ‘ringed’ sections, and does not include this pairing of Diomedes and Athena at the beginning and the end of the ‘episode’ (if it is, in fact, a performed ‘episode’).
- 62 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 288, calls this break ‘arbitrary’.
- 63 Cf. Arthur, M.B. ‘The Divided World of *Iliad VI*’, *Women’s Studies*, 8 (1981) 21–46, 25, for how Sarpedon’s family bleeds into the battlefield.

- 64 See Redfield, *Nature and Culture*, 20 for reading the *Iliad* from ‘social relations’ and ‘social situations’. For network theory and the *Iliad*, see Rydberg-Cox, J. ‘Social Networks and the Language of Greek Tragedy’, *Journal of the Chicago Colloquium on Digital Humanities and Computer Science* 1.3 (2011) 1–11, 8–9; cf. MacCarron P. and R. Kenna, ‘Universal properties of mythological networks’, *Europhysics Letters* 99.2 (2012): <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1209/0295-5075/99/28002/meta> For an awesome graphic of the *Iliad*’s social network, check out <http://moebio.com/iliad/> ‘Network’. Network theory has also been taking off in television studies’ approach to characters: see Booth, P. ‘The Television Social Network: Exploring TV Characters’, *Communication Studies* 63.3 (2012) 309–27; for an analysis of character hierarchy through social networks in *Game of Thrones*, see Beveridge, A. and J. Shan, ‘Network of Thrones’, *Math Horizons* (2016) 18–22.
- 65 See Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 104, for a visual representation of this space (Fig. 4).
- 66 *Game of Thrones* (HBO, 2011–), Season 5 Episode 8.
- 67 *The Good Wife* (CBS, 2009–2016), Season 7 Episode 1.
- 68 Cf. 6.55–60; for considerations of rape as a part of the Achaian war-plan, see Graziosi, and Haubold, *Iliad Book VI*, 29.
- 69 Cf. Odysseus’s talk of missing wives at 2.289–93.
- 70 Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 45: ‘... the narrator uses the pattern common for mortal journeys, in which an episode in a different location occupies the time between departure and arrival’. This beat would then fall under the category of the ‘fill-in’ technique, or ‘Deckszenen’; cf. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 77; de Jong, *Narratological Commentary*, xiv. But I hate these terms: they make it sound like these beats are not important, and they are: they are not Band-Aids or putty over cracks. Consider *Elementary*, Season 4, Episode 18. Holmes and Watson are on a case where they investigate a survivalist group; the group’s secrecy requires Holmes and Watson to be driven in a specially-adapted car with blacked-out windows to the group’s bunker. The episode uses this journey as a beat where Holmes and Watson discuss Holmes’ relationship problems. The time in the car does not advance the episode’s ‘A storyline’ (solving the crime), but it greatly develops the characters, and sheds insight onto long-running character story arcs.
- 71 For discussion of the armour exchange between Glaukos and Diomedes, see Donlan, W. ‘The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy’, *Phoenix* 43.1 (1989) 1–15; Traill, D. ‘Gold Armor for Bronze and Homer’s Use of Compensatory TIMH’, *Classical Philology* 89.4 (1989) 301–5; Grethlein, ‘Memory and Material Objects’, 40.
- 72 I have been wrestling with whether or not we can call a beat or beat sequence a ‘digression’ without devaluing our experience of it, or its essential value to the narrative as a whole. Cf. Segal, C. ‘Tithonus and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*: A Comment’, *Arethusa* 19.1 (1986) 37–47, 37: ‘The very notion of “digression,” in fact, is

probably inappropriate to the more fluid and paradigmatically oriented movement of archaic narrative.’ This is not quite the question about ‘digression’ that I would raise. I would say that in both epic and serial television, the audience *expects* to jump back and forth between characters, for scenes that do not necessarily ‘advance the plot’: in following different character arcs, almost every scene is a ‘digression’, but really, none are. Television allows us to revel in these scenes. Critics and fans only become upset about scenes that do not advance plot *or* character (certainly *not* the case for the Diomedes and Glaukos scene here), while keeping audiences ‘waiting’. A good example of this is when *The Walking Dead* ‘killed’ Glenn in the third episode of the show’s sixth season, only to show that he is, in fact, alive, four episodes later. Reviewing that ‘return episode’, *A. V. Club*’s thoughtful *Walking Dead* critic, Zack Handlen, notes: ‘In presenting this as a cliffhanger, the creative team drew attention to the absurdity of it, dragging out the question until everyone had a good chance to argue and write think pieces and generally over discuss what is really just an elaborate fake-out. Glenn is a little more desperate than he was before, but not excessively so, and his conversations with Enid suggest he’s still as determined as ever to be the good guy. So why have such a scene at all, unless it’s to fuck with the audience?’; in ‘Someone finds some balloons on *The Walking Dead*’, *A. V. Club*, 22 November 2015: <http://www.avclub.com/tvclub/someone-finds-some-balloons-walking-dead-228783>

- 73 For a discussion of the narrator ‘following’ Hektor through Ilion spatially, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 38–41.
- 74 Schadewaldt, ‘Hector and Andromache’, 128.
- 75 *Ibid.*; cf. Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, 147–9 for discussions of Priam’s palace and character movements in this beat sequence.
- 76 Cf. Scodel, ‘Theory of Mind’, for discussions of assumptions between characters about character motivation, and 325–6 for discussion of this passage in particular.
- 77 Cf. Nestor at 11.637–43; Odysseus at 19.160–6. See Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, ad loc., 152, for further discussion of wine as a restorative.
- 78 For those who belittle Paris’s handling of his arms here, see Schein, *Mortal Hero*, 173; Kakridis, *J. Homeric Researches*, Lund (1949) 45–6; Mueller, *The Iliad*, 37; Meltzer, G.S., ‘The Role of Comic Perspectives in Shaping Homer’s Tragic Vision’, *Classical World* 83.4 (1990) 265–81, 275–6: ‘Paris is handling his weapons as a child might play with its toys beside its mother’; cf. ΣβT ad 6.321, on περικαλλέα. For the opposite argument, see Leaf, W. *Commentary on the Iliad*. Macmillan (1900) ad loc., which draws parallels with Odysseus: *Od.* 21.393 τόξον ἐνώμα πάντη ἀναστρωφῶν and *Od.* 19.586 τόξον ἀμφαφῶντας means ‘handling’ the bow with the intention of using it; cf. Hijmans, B.L. ‘Alexandros and his grief’, *Grazer Beiträge* 3 (1975) 177–90, 78 n. 4.
- 79 For a full discussion of the vocative δαιμόνι, see Brunius-Nilsson, E. *Δαιμόνι: an inquiry into a mode of apostrophe in old Greek literature*. Uppsala (1955), esp. 19–37.

- 80 See Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, ad loc., 170.
- 81 Cf. 2.391–3, 4.242–6, 5.472–7, 12.248–50.
- 82 ἄχος generally signals some kind of humiliation (cf. Odysseus at 2.171; Helen at 3.412; Agamemnon at 4.169); and with both Odysseus and Agamemnon, it is a humiliation linked with military withdrawal and defeat. This humiliation is particularly interesting when compared to that of Helen, as the couple both feel *achos* as a result of the actions of Aphrodite. Perhaps Paris feels grief because he was forced to retreat from his battle with Menelaos, at the compulsion of Aphrodite.
- 83 For Paris's traditional death in the *Little Iliad*, see Burgess, *Tradition*, 75; Holmberg, I. 'The Creation of the Ancient Greek Epic Cycle', *Oral Tradition* 13.2 (1998) 456–78, 467.
- 84 For Helen's metapoetic self-awareness, see Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 96–8.
- 85 In television, character dialogue that refers to its own poetics fits into the trope called 'Leaning on the Fourth Wall', and television shows across genres utilize it. For an excellent compilation of examples from television, see tvtropes.org, <http://vtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/LeaningOnTheFourthWall>.
- 86 Cf. Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, ad loc., 183; Rutherford, R.B. 'Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102 (1982) 145–60, 153.
- 87 Schadewaldt, 'Hector and Andromache', 131.
- 88 Cf. Graziosi and Haubold, *Iliad VI*, ad loc. 372–3, 184; cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 122, for the narrator's 'omnipresence'.
- 89 Cf. Richardson's discussion of scene change: 'Frequently the logical connection is parallelism, or at least correspondence, of actions, usually with the implication of simultaneity.' Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115.
- 90 This is a variation on the usual 'shiny-helmeted Hektor' (κορυθαίολος 'Ἔκτωρ; 37 appearances), which metrically fits with Hektor in the dative or accusative: see 5.699, 6.398, 13.720, 15.221, 15.458, 16.358, 16.536, 16.654.
- 91 For Hektor's name and the etymological implication it has for him as the 'holder' / 'defender', see PIE *segh- 'to hold, protect': cf. Cunliffe s.v. ἔχω for 'protect'; cf. Watkins, C. "Homer and Hittite Revisited." in P. Knox and E. Foss (eds), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. (Teubner, 1998) 201–11, 206–11.
- 92 See Minchin, E. 'Communication without Words: Body Language, 'Picturableability' and Memorability in the *Iliad*', *Ordia Prima* (2008) 17–38, esp. 21–6.
- 93 *Alias* (ABC, 2001–6), Season 4 Episode 21.
- 94 See Kakridis, J.T. *Homeric Researches*, (Lund, 1949) 20–1 for the 'ascending scale of affection'.
- 95 Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 89.
- 96 For an excellent analysis of Hektor's use of modes of memory here, see Minchin, E. 'Memory and Memories: Personal, Social, and Cultural Memory in the Poems of Homer', in *Homeric Contexts*, 83–99, 93.
- 97 Minchin, 'Communication without Words', 24.

Chapter 2: Killing Time

- 1 For a full discussion of type-scenes, see Edwards, ‘Homer and Oral Tradition’.
- 2 Lavender-Smith, J. ‘Loose- and Dead-End Afterlives of *Battlestar Galactica* and *Lost*’, in *Time in Television Narrative: Exploring Temporality in Twenty First-Century Programming*, ed. Melissa Ames, (University Press of Mississippi, 2012) 56–68, 58.
- 3 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 184.
- 4 Hampson, ‘Determinants’, 249.
- 5 Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 93–6. For a thorough discussion of the parallels between the duel here and that between Paris and Menalaos in Book 3, see Kirk, G.S. ‘The Formal Duels in Books 3 and 7 of the *Iliad*’, in Fenik, B. *Homer: Tradition and Invention, Cincinnati Classical Studies* ns 2 (Brill, 1978) 18–40.
- 6 Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 13: this would count under the category of ‘a change of scene based on hearing’.
- 7 For a complete list of prolepses of Hektor’s death, according to narratological terms, see de Jong, ‘Homer’ in *Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*, 29.
- 8 Contra Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 94.
- 9 Kozak, L. ‘Oaths between warriors in epic and tragedy’, in A.H Sommerstein and I.C. Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 307 (2014) 60–7, 66.
- 10 Cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 74, 153–5; Minchin, ‘Memory and Memories’, 91.
- 11 See Scholia bT at 4.127; Block, E. ‘The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112 (1982) 7–22, 16; Kirk, *Commentary*, ad loc., 247. For contrary arguments that apostrophe emerges out of metrical necessity rather than out of the relationship between the poet and his character, see Yamagata, N. ‘The Apostrophe in Homer as Part of the Oral Technique’, (1989) 91–103, 91
- 12 Louden, ‘Pivotal Contrafactuals’, 188–9.
- 13 For a discussion of this paradigm as ‘invented’ for the context, see Willcock, M. ‘Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*’, in D. Cairns, *Oxford Readings in Homer’s Iliad* (Oxford University Press, 2001), 435–55, 442–3.
- 14 Aias’s kills: 4.549, 5.717, 6.9; Agamemnon’s kills: 5.42, 5.630, 6.38, 6.76; Odysseus’s kills: 4.579, seven at 5.783f., 6.34.
- 15 For an extended discussion of Hektor’s inferiority in this scene, see Farron, ‘Character of Hector’, 43.
- 16 This extended list of what Hektor ‘knows’ have led several scholars to focus on the idea that Hektor’s war-craft is something which he has learned, rather than a natural instinct and lust for fighting: Lattimore goes so far as to say that Hektor is ‘not bloodthirsty enough to be a natural warrior’. Lattimore, R. *The Iliad*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1951) xxiv; Mackie, *Talking Trojan*, 103; Martin, *Language*

- of *Heroes*, 132; Duban J.M. ‘Les duels majeurs de l’*Iliade* et le langage d’Hektor’, *Les Études Classiques* 49 (1981) 97–124, 106–7. For a more positive reading of Hektor’s declaration of his skills here, see Kirk, ‘Formal Duels’, 27–8.
- 17 Kirk, ‘Formal Duels’, 38, shows that the language in this duel is more typical of a funeral game than of a battle confrontation, reiterating the likelihood of this non-lethal outcome.
- 18 For discussion of the uneven exchange of the truce here (sword vs belt: 7.303–5) between Aias and Hektor, see Donlan, ‘Uneven Exchange’, 10–11. For the duel as part of a larger pattern of Hektor’s inferiority to the main Achaians, see Traill, ‘Unfair to Hector’, 301.
- 19 Kirk, ‘Formal Duels’, 25, identifies the ‘interventions’ that end each duel without a death; cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 97–102, for the ‘interruption’ here in ring composition with that in Book 3.
- 20 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 159.
- 21 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 129.
- 22 Cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, Ch. 3, especially 95, where Garcia says that ‘each wall in fact functions as a substitute for a great hero . . . the walls participate in the same temporal economy as the heroes themselves’; see also Grethlein, J. ‘Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 128 (2008) 27–51, who refers to wall ‘biographies’, along with those of precious objects.
- 23 Schadewaldt, ‘Hektor in der *Ilias*’, 7–8.
- 24 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115; Schadewaldt, ‘Hektor in der *Ilias*’, 7.
- 25 For the speeding-up of story time here compared to performance time from the day covering Books 2–7 and the next day, see Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 144–7; cf. Cook, E.F. ‘On the “Importance” of *Iliad* Book 8’, *Classical Philology* 104.2 (2009) 133–61, 143.
- 26 For a thorough discussion of the Achaian wall and its impermanence, see Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 97–110.
- 27 For keeping this book division, see Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 289; Heiden, ‘Book Divisions’, 73.
- 28 For the significance of Book 8 to the *Iliad*’s narrative, see Cook, ‘Importance of Book 8’. See also Kelly, *Commentary*, esp. 378–84.
- 29 For discussion of Zeus’s use of the scales here, or *kerostasia*, see Morrison, J. ‘*Kerostasia*, the Dictates of Fate, and the Will of Zeus in the *Iliad*’, *Arethusa* 30 (1997) 276–96, 292–3; Dietrich, B.C. ‘The Judgment of Zeus’, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 107.2 (1964) 97–125, 97–9.
- 30 Cf. the list of men willing to face Hektor at 7.162–9: Agamemnon, Diomedes, the Aiantes, Idomeneus, Meriones, Eurypylos, Thoas, Odysseus.
- 31 For an extended discussion of Nestor’s rescue scene, and an extensive rebuttal to Kirk’s criticisms of the scene, see Cook, ‘Importance of Book 8’; for a thorough

- rebuttal to neoanalyst responses to the scene and its basis in the *Aithopis*, with an analysis of Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28–42 and its relationship to the *Iliad*, see Kelly, A. ‘Neoanalysis and the “Nestorbedrängnis”’: A Test Case, *Hermes* 134 (2006) 1–25.
- 32 Louden, ‘Pivotal Contrafactuals’, 187 n 18, classifies this contrafactual as one that serves ‘to keep the narrative away from incidents that would go against fate.’ Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 9, simply classifies this contrafactual as ‘Type A’, ‘something contrary to fact would have happened, had not someone acted to prevent it.’
- 33 Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 11, classifies this contrafactual as Type B: ‘so in accord with fate and mythical fact but can be contrafactual and contradictory because it is premature.’ This confirms Zeus’s actions here as in line with the *kerostasia* at 8.68–77.
- 34 Cf. 6.459–62; 7.87–91. For Hektor’s tendency towards this and Diomedes’ comment in this scene, see Beck, D. ‘Character-quoted speech in the *Iliad*’, *Phoenix* 62.1–2 (2008) 162–83, esp. 174–5.
- 35 For a discussion of Diomedes’ shame here, see Cairns, D.L. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, (Clarendon Press, 1993) 72–4.
- 36 Kirk, *Commentary*, ad loc. 8.161–6, 310; cf. Redfield, *Nature and Culture*, 142. Redfield argues that Hektor ‘changes’ here: ‘he has become less modest, and more important, he becomes predictable. He does exactly what Diomedes a few lines earlier had said he would do.’
- 37 For the theme of a hero trying something three times and then stopped by a god on the fourth, see Muellner, L. *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*. (Cornell, 1996) 12–18; Buchan, M. *The Limits of Heroism: Homer and the Ethics of Reading*. (University of Michigan Press, 2004) 50–6; Fenik, B. *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 216, on Patroklos and the ‘three times’ motif.
- 38 See Kirk, *Commentary*, ad loc., 312–3 for a discussion of these lines’ histories, as several ancient commentators athetised them.
- 39 See Kirk, *Commentary*, ad 8.196–7, 314.
- 40 Cf. Glaukos’s speech at 17.156–63, which also lays out a plan for capturing trophies as a strategy to achieve an ends (there, to get Sarpedon’s body back). See Kelly, *Commentary*, ad loc. for the assertion that Hektor’s focus on the armour here is based in his need for *kleos*, and to assert Diomedes’ continuing importance (which he thinks is mistaken).
- 41 The μὲν . . . δ’ in 8.211f and the imperfect ἀγόμενον at 8.212, create a very strong ‘meanwhile’ sense between these two scenes; that while gods are talking about the evils done to men, men are actually suffering them. See Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 31n 49, for a full discussion of epic’s ability for showing multiple, simultaneous actions; Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115, for ‘parallelism’.
- 42 Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 24, names this as one of only four cases of divine intervention in a contrafactual, with the others at 12.292, 17.71, and 21.545.

- 43 Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, summary, 5–8.
- 44 See M.G. Ciani, 'Le morti minori dell'*Iliade*', *Atti/Istituto Veneto di Scienze* 122 (1963–4) 403–15.
- 45 Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 153 for the 'typicality' of catalogue before battle; Gaertner, J. F. 'The Homeric Catalogues and Their Function in Epic Narrative', *Hermes* 129 (2001) 298–305, 299–300, for the function of these catalogues.
- 46 For the connection between Hektor and madness, see Lincoln, B. 'Homeric λύσσα: "Wolfish Rage"', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 80 (1975) 98–105. Cf. Mueller, *The Iliad*, 47, who understands Hektor 'changing', 'that the persistent use of this motif with Hektor suggests that the withdrawal of Achilles has put him in some sense beside himself'. I see no evidence for this overall arc within the *Iliad*.
- 47 See Edwards, A.T. 'Aristos Achaiōn: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the *Iliad*', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* n.s. 17.2 (1984) 61–80, 75.
- 48 For discussion of the simile here, see Porter, D.H. 'Violent Juxtaposition in the Similes in the *Iliad*', *Classical Journal* 68.1 (1972) 11–21, 11–12. For memory and simile imagery, see Minchin, E. 'Similes in Homer: Image, Mind's Eye, and Memory', in *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. by J. Watson, (Brill, 2001) 25–52.
- 49 See Collins, *Immortal Armor*, esp. 76–127.
- 50 Cf. 9.237; Lincoln, 'Homeric λύσσα', 99.
- 51 Cf. Kelly, *Commentary*, ad loc., 400. Cf. Purves, A.C. *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge, 2010) 30–4, discussing the gods' exceptional vision in an eusynoptic context, implying the gods' ability to 'see' the plot as well as the Iliadic landscape.
- 52 Cf. *Od.* 4.235–89 for Achaians sneaking into Troy; cf. Dué, C. and M. Ebbot, *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush*, (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2010), 31–87 for a thorough discussion of ambush in the epic tradition.
- 53 Minchin, E. 'Can One Ever Forget? Homer on the Persistence of Painful Memories', *Scholia* 15 (2006) 2–16, 11.
- 54 Cf. the 'eusynoptic' view of the *Iliad*'s plot, Purves, *Space and Time*, 2–3, 5, 24–64; Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 96–109.
- 55 These features would also point towards Book 10 being, at the very least, well-integrated into the *Iliad*'s serial narrative. For arguments against the 'authenticity' of the *Doloneia*, see Danek, *Studien zur Dolonie*, 9 n 1. cf. Dué and Ebbot, *Iliad 10*, 1–29. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 152–3, 289, argues against including Book 10 at all; Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 118–28, argues for its inclusion, and I tend to agree. See also Heiden, 'Book Divisions', esp. 70–5.
- 56 See 10.199, 10.298, 10.343, 10.349, 10.387, 10.469 for references to the corpse and gore-littered ground.

- 57 For a reading of Book 10 as part of traditional ‘ambush’ poetics, against a firm exclusion of the book from the *Iliad*, see Dué, C., ‘Maneuvers in the Dark of Night: *Iliad* 10 in the Twenty-First Century’, in *Homeric Contexts*, 175–83.
- 58 Danek, G. *Studien zur Dolonie*, 12, on 10.11–3: ‘All das stimmt exakt mit den Voraussetzungen überein, die durch das Θ gegeben sind. Auch alle weiteren Hinweise auf die lagernden Troer entsprechen dem, was im Θ darüber ausgesagt ist.’
- 59 The μηρία at 10.104 as Zeus’s epithet responds to Hektor’s μηρίασθαι at 10.48: Nestor seems to ‘reply’ to Agamemnon’s speech by saying that Zeus, the master planner, can out-plan Hektor’s plans.
- 60 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115.
- 61 Callaway, C. ‘Perjury and the Unsworn Oath’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993) 15–25, 19, uses Aristotle to show that Hektor does not perjure himself here.
- 62 de Jong, ‘Homer’ in *Time*, 25.
- 63 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 111.
- 64 The lack of recaps for Book 10 might also point to its being a later addition, that expertly incorporates action prior to it, but then makes no impact on pre-existing material that comes after it; the only true ‘recap’ being 11.56 recapping the position of the Trojans as stated at 10.160.
- 65 Cf. Hainsworth, B. *The Iliad: Commentary Volume III: Books 9–12* (Cambridge University Press, 1993) ad loc., 364: ‘This great epic moment makes an impressive halfway point of the *Iliad* and the perfect note on which to conclude a ῥαψωδία.’ Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 290, supports the book division, but downplays its importance.
- 66 See Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 43.
- 67 For arming scenes, see Armstrong, J. ‘The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*’, *American Journal of Philology* 79 (1958) 337–54.
- 68 See Minchin, ‘Describing and Narrating’, 48–64; cf. Grethlein, ‘Memory and Material Objects’, 37; Cf. *Rhetorica Herennium* 3.22.37.
- 69 Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, see n. 46.
- 70 While Morrison does not mention this passage, it looks ahead to Hektor’s exit; cf. Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 1–2; see also Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 9–10.
- 71 Tsagalis, *From Listeners to Viewers*, 306, places this zoom-out in the centre of a thorough breakdown of what he refers to as ‘visual units’ in this battle sequence.
- 72 Cf. Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc. 12.151, 334.
- 73 Cf. Marks, J. ‘Context as Hypertext: Divine Rescue Scenes in the *Iliad*’, in *Trends in Classics*, F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (eds), 2.2 (2010) 302–22, 312.
- 74 Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 10–12.
- 75 Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc. 192–4, 246.
- 76 For this contrafactual (if-not situation), see de Jong, *Narrators*, 75.

- 77 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', rightly categorises this as 'Type B', an action according to fate but premature, 11; she also points out that this is one of only two instances where a contrafactual turns towards the Trojans' favour, 12.
- 78 Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 16.
- 79 *Ibid.*, 10.
- 80 Cf. Diomedes' own concern about his reputation and Hektor at 8.145–66.
- 81 Aineias *almost* dies at 5.310; Tlepolemos does die at 5.659; Hektor *almost* dies at 14.439; Deïpyros does die at 13.580; Andromache faints at 22.446. See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 33–5, for discussion.
- 82 Cf. Smith, *Engaging Characters*, 146–8.
- 83 For a complete discussion of how Hektor's exit from battle here serves as upsetting the anticipation created by Zeus's promise, see Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 1–2; cf. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 14–17.
- 84 For a discussion of the left flank in the spatial composition of the Trojan plain, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 45.
- 85 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', categorises this as 'Type B', an action according to fate but premature, 11.
- 86 Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc., 282, claims that the equality of 11.540f. and 11.264f. implies that both Agamemnon (there) and Hektor (here) are 'not actually fighting'. I think that this is absolutely not the case given the context of both. Agamemnon only stops fighting in the next lines as his wound starts to crust over, and Hektor has been fighting for all these lines prior, with no indication that he is not fighting.
- 87 Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc. 11.543, 282, discusses the possible interpolation of this line as an explanation for 11.542.
- 88 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 290, calls this next beat sequence 'a distinct narrative unit', but too short to be a 'book'. In performance, it feels hard to say what might be 'too short'. I only suggest a possible break here, without making any declarations about whether this 'belongs' with the rest of Book 11.
- 89 Cf. Pedrick, V. 'The Paradigmatic Nature of Nestor's Speech in *Iliad*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113 (1983) 55–68: 61, 67–8, on this 'lesson' for Achilles, heard instead by Patroklos for ironic effect; see also Alden, M. *Homer Beside Himself. Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford, 2000) 90–8.
- 90 See Martin, *Language of Heroes*, 80, for a discussion of Nestor's power or persuasion through the performance of memory.
- 91 Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, 19.
- 92 Cf. Martin, *Language of Heroes*, 82.
- 93 Mittell, *Complex TV*, 189–90, gives an example where a *Battlestar Galactica* 'previously on...' montage used a clip of Ellen Tigh's death, eighteen months after it occurred, 'spoiling' that Ellen would somehow return in the episode.

- 94 For an extensive discussion of the spatial arrangements of events around the wall through these next battle episodes, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, esp. 56–86. Clay, too, says that ‘In the next few books, the Greek fortifications will exercise a critical narrative function’, 59.
- 95 Cf. Mueller, *The Iliad*, 37.
- 96 Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 104–7.
- 97 Cf. Ford, A. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Cornell University Press, 1994) 151–2.
- 98 For lion and boar similes, see Scott, W.C. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Brill, 1974), 58–62, esp. 61 n 4 for Hektor’s lion similes.
- 99 Cf. Scholia T ad 12.46b (Erbse); cf. Patroklos at 16.753.
- 100 Cf. Clark, M. ‘Poulydamas and Hektor’, *College Literature* 34.2 (2007) 85–106, 86–7.
- 101 For how these division arrangements carry through the coming battle narrative, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 60–1.
- 102 See Scodel and Whitman, ‘Sequence and Simultaneity’, 6 n 11.
- 103 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 62–3.
- 104 Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc. 12.199, 339.
- 105 Cairns, ‘Horror and Pity’, 80 n 20.
- 106 Clark, ‘Poulydamas and Hektor’, 87–91, for a full discussion of this exchange.
- 107 We can assume that Poulydamas does make it safely back into Troy’s walls from Hektor’s fear that Poulydamas would rebuke him should he go back inside the city walls, 22.100.
- 108 Cf. Agamemnon at 2.2.391–4; Hektor at 6.6.329f.
- 109 Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 11, sees this as a ‘Type B’ conditional, which contradicts a destined action, which does not feel quite right here, as here Sarpedon’s intervention allows for the destined break-through of the Achaian wall (cf. 8.470–83).
- 110 I follow Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 67 and de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 75, on the significance of this contrafactual to Hektor’s later success at breaking through the wall.
- 111 This is one place where the *Iliad* diverges from my television-honed expectations. When I see a random add-on crew member to a mission, I think, ‘well, that guy is going to die’, thinking of the common red-shirt trope. But Pandion does not die: he just appears and is never mentioned again. Cf. Hainsworth, *Commentary*, ad loc., 357: ‘Pandion is otherwise unknown’.
- 112 This is the first use of the verb εἰσάλλομαι, suggesting that Hektor is the first to ‘leap into’ the wall. But Sarpedon did, of course, do some damage in pulling down the parapet at 12.397–400, which will cause Glaukos to refer to Sarpedon as the first to have leapt into the walls at 16.588.
- 113 Cf. Minchin, ‘Communicating without words’, 25–6, for ‘pictureability and memorability’.
- 114 Scholia bT ad 12.463b (Erbse) explains the phrase νυκτὶ θεῶν τάλαντος by noting νυκτὶ τὰ φοβερὰ ὁμοιοῦσιν. See Mueller, *The Iliad*, 85.

- 115 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 67–8.
- 116 For the end of Book 12 as a ‘cliffhanger’, cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 142.
- 117 Cf. retrospective, ‘appositive’ summary, Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*. 31.
- 118 Minchin, ‘Spatial Memory’, 25, makes the excellent point that this spatial distance between Poseidon and Zeus comments on their relationship; for discussion of Poseidon’s movement through established space, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 68–9.
- 119 Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 16–17, sees this scene as an arming scene, serving a similar function of foregrounding character.
- 120 For an extensive discussion of the ‘problem’ here of continuity with the Aiantes and Teukros, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 69–70. For me, the Aiantes were last seen fighting together at 12.335–64, before Telamonian Aias tells Oilean Aias that he will shortly return as he goes off to fight with Teukros (12.366–9). It feels ‘naturalised’, as Scodel would say, that in the chaos of the breaking wall, Teukros and Telamonian Aias would find Oilean Aias once again while Poseidon makes his way to the battlefield. Cf. Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 19–21.
- 121 For a discussion of this scene in studies of Homeric warfare, see Van Wees, H. ‘The Homeric Way of War: The *Iliad* and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)’, *Greece & Rome* 41.1 (1994) 1–18, 3.
- 122 This simile sends mixed signals about Hektor’s agency. The boulder that Hektor becomes is torn from the cliff exists between passivity and agency, wrenched free as it is from its place by a torrential storm. Before, Hektor was the storm (11.305–8, 12.40). The ῥήξας here, the ‘tearing’ of the rock from the cliff, is the same verb that has been so prevalent in the Trojan campaign to tear down the wall, the action that Hektor himself took when he finally arrived at the gates of the Achaian battlements (12.90, 12.198, 12.224, 12.257, 12.262, 12.291, 12.308, 12.341, 12.411, 12.418, 12.440, 12.459, 13.124). The regularity of that verb for Trojan action (even in performance, this means that you would hear it almost every two minutes in a half hour) makes the reversal stand out all the more.
- 123 For the vividness of this ‘ball-game’, see Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 72; cf. Elmer, D. ‘*Epikoinos*: The Ball Game *Episkuros* and *Iliad* 12.421–23’, *Classical Philology* 103 (2008) 414–23, on other references to athletic ‘ball games’ functioning as virtual similes for war.
- 124 Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 119–23.
- 125 Janko, R. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4: *Books 13–16*, (Cambridge, 1994) ad loc., 105–6, says that Aineias’s anger here explains his absence from the narrative.
- 126 Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115, ‘parallelism’. Cf. ‘graphic match’ cut, discussion by Thompson, K. and D. Bordwell, ‘Observations on film art’, davidbordwell.net, 9 December 2011: <http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/2011/05/25/graphic-content-ahead/>
- 127 See Chapter One, n 61.

- 128 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 120; cf. n 11.
- 129 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 126.
- 130 Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 106–8, draws a parallel to 11.497–542.
- 131 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 75.
- 132 See Beye, C.R. ‘Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1968) 345–73.
- 133 Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 11, categorises this contrafactual as ‘Type B’, postponing a destined event.
- 134 Cf. *Od.* 11.243 for a wave like a mountain; Bradley, E.M. ‘Hector and the Simile of the Snowy Mountain’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98 (1967) 37–41, 40, suggests other Iliadic images of more dynamic ‘snowing’ to explain the simile; Lane, N. ‘*Iliad* 13.754–55’, *Illinois Classical Studies* 30 (2005) 1–5, also likes the mountain comparison, and Hektor’s association with winds; Phillips, T. ‘*Iliad* 13.754: ΟΡΕΙ ΝΙΦΟΕΝΤΙ ΕΟΙΚΩΣ’, *Classical Quarterly* 65.2 (2015) 439–43, likes the poetic force of the juxtaposition of Hektor as an ‘unmoving’ mountain.
- 135 Of the six Trojans the narrative introduces here, only Askanios was introduced previously (2.862); Phalkes appears only here and at his death at 14.513, as does Morys, who dies at 14.514; the other three Trojans – Orthaios, Polyphetes, and Palmys – only ever appear here.
- 136 Cf. Hektor at 8.538–41; Hephaistos at 18.463–7. See Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 147, on ‘impossible wishes’; cf. Combellack, F. ‘The Wish Without Desire’, *American Journal of Philology* 102.2 (1981) 115–19.
- 137 Cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 143.
- 138 For the tradition of Ajax’s death and burial, see Holt, P. ‘Ajax’s Burial in Early Greek Epic’, *American Journal of Philology* 113.3 (1992) 319–31, 324–5.
- 139 For a full discussion of Nestor’s recap and Zielinski’s law here, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 78–9.
- 140 This is slight misdirection on Poseidon’s part, as Agamemnon will not see the Trojans fleeing back towards the city; besides a brief glimpse of him rallying the troops at 14.380, we will not see Agamemnon in action on the battlefield again in the *Iliad*.
- 141 For Hera’s ‘arming’, see Erbse, H. ‘Zeus und Here auf dem Idagebirge’, *Antike und Abendland* 16.2 (1970) 93–112, 96–7; cf. Golden, L. ‘Διὸς ἀπάτη and the Unity of *Iliad* 14’, *Mnemosyne* 42.1 (1989) 1–11, 5–6.
- 142 For the audience acquiring the ‘script’ of arming that they can recognise, see Minchin, ‘Scripts and Themes’, 235 n 29.
- 143 Epstein, *Crafty TV Writing*, 99, discusses a callback in specific reference to dialogue: ‘a *callback* – a line we’ve heard before but now it’s given a fresh and often ironic meaning.’
- 144 See tvtropes.org for ‘ironic echo’ examples: <http://vtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/IronicEcho> An ‘internal homage’ goes further than a callback in that it

- ‘recreates images, lines, or even entire scenes from the franchise’s past; see <http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/InternalHomage>
- 145 For examples of callbacks in *Breaking Bad*, and its spin-off series *Better Call Saul*, see Rowles, D. ‘These 25 Amazing Callbacks from the Final Season of “Breaking Bad” Will Blow Out Your Mindhole’, *Uproxx*, 10 September 2013: <http://uproxx.com/tv/25-amazing-callbacks-final-season-breaking-bad/> and Raymond, A.K. ‘Saulbacks: An Exhaustive Compendium of All the “Breaking Bad” References in “Better Call Saul”’, *Esquire*, 7 April 2015: <http://www.esquire.com/entertainment/tv/a32576/better-call-saul-breaking-bad-references/>
- 146 For parallels in Hera’s mission in Book 14 and Poseidon’s mission in Book 13, see Erbse, ‘Zeus und Here’, 93–112.
- 147 For discussions of tragic forms in the *Iliad*, see Rutherford, ‘Tragic Form’, and Redfield, *Nature and Culture*.
- 148 Cf. Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 211.
- 149 Cf. Sarpedon at 16.452; see Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 6–7, for fallen tree similes and heroic death.
- 150 Instances where darkness closes over the eyes of a hero are actually quite ranging, though often suggest death or near-death. For death, cf. Tlepolemos, 5.659; Deïpyros, 13.580; Idomeneus’s wish to kill Trojans, 13.425. For near-death, cf. Aineias, 5.310; Hektor, 11.356.
- 151 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 112: ‘Scene changes can be considered . . . a revelation that we are sharing our viewpoint with one of the characters.’ One example from television of this kind of perception-based beat change: *The Flash* (CW, 2014–), Season 2, Episode 18, where we watch an interaction between Barry and Joe, only to have the camera shift to watching them interact over Caitlin’s shoulder, so that in the next beat Caitlin comments to Iris that Barry and Joe ‘have a special bond’.
- 152 See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 10, for this kind of ‘chain-reaction’ battle sequence.
- 153 For this cluster of deaths and their tie to the characters’ catalogue listing, see Marks, ‘Ἀρχοὺς αὐ νεῶν ἐπέω’, 103.
- 154 See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 45; cf. Edwards, M. ‘Type-scenes and Homeric Hospitality’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 105 (1975) 51–72 esp. 60, 66.
- 155 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 224, says ‘Since (Zeus) is in fact asleep, a pedant (in T) emended his name away. But the irony arouses suspense, reminding us that Zeus’s slumber may end abruptly at any time; he awakens only four lines later in the middle of a verse.’
- 156 *Ibid.*
- 157 We can compare this ambiguity of break in continuous action to that between Books 20 and 21. For further discussion of this break, see Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 290; Heiden, ‘Book Divisions’, 71–3.

- 158 Torrance, I. ‘The Oaths of the Gods’ in Sommerstein and Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing*, 195–212, 198.
- 159 Heiden, ‘Three movements’, 20; Schadewaldt, ‘Hektor’, 17.
- 160 Zeus most likely saves the revelation of Sarpedon’s death for last because it has the most emotional import for him.
- 161 For an extensive discussion of criticism for this passage, see Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 234.
- 162 Zielinski, T. ‘The treatment of Simultaneous Events in Ancient Epic’, trans. C. Krojzl and S.R. van der Mije, in *Homer: Critical Assessments, Vol. 4*, de Jong, I.J.F. (ed.), 317–27, 322.
- 163 Cf. Rutherford, ‘Tragic Form’, 153;
- 164 Cf. Reichel, *Fernbeziehungen*, 170.
- 165 See Segal, C. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (Brill, 1972) 19.
- 166 I follow Clay here in thinking this scene shows a different part of the battlements falling, rather than a ‘problem’ of the whole wall being destroyed contra 12.10–35. Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 82–3.
- 167 See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 10, 22–3, for the battle-scene typicality of death and response.
- 168 See Fenik, *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 10, 22–3, for the battle-scene typicality of death and response.
- 169 Cf. Rutherford, ‘Tragic Form’, 153.
- 170 Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, ‘parallelism’, 115.
- 171 Cf. Hektor to Paris 13.772–5.
- 172 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 209–1, emphasises how *pathos* emerges in this scene, in part through this apostrophe; Block, ‘Narrator Speaks’, 21.
- 173 See Clarke, M. ‘Manhood and heroism’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, R. Fowler, ed. (Cambridge, 2004) 74–90, 85.
- 174 Cf. 17.198–208.
- 175 For the pathos in this scene, see Griffin, J. ‘Homeric Pathos and Objectivity’, *Classical Quarterly* 26.2 (1976) 161–87, 168.
- 176 Cf. 4.429; 17.366. See de Jong, *Narrators*, 54–7, for a discussion of ‘you’ in the *Iliad*.
- 177 See Burgess, *Tradition*, 64, for a discussion of Protesilaos.
- 178 For ‘not yet’ terms, see οὐδ’ ἄρα τοῖ at 15.708; οὐδ’ ἔτ’ at 15.710; οὐκέτ’ at 15.727.

Chapter 3: Ends

- 1 Structural arguments for tri-partiteness of the *Iliad* generally put the beginning of the third act, or the ‘end’, at the beginning of Book 18, based on the battle-day that Books 11–18 cover, though some go earlier into Book 16 or 17 for the beginning of

- their ‘end’; for a helpful breakdown of opinions of the ‘three acts’, see Heiden, ‘Three movements’, 8.
- 2 For curiosity and suspense in audiences, see Mittell, *Complex TV*, esp. 170–80.
 - 3 VanDerWerff, T. ‘*In Media Res*’ in ‘What TV trope aggravates you the most?’, *A.V. Club*, 14 May, 2014. <http://www.avclub.com/article/what-tv-trope-aggravates-you-most-202160>
 - 4 See Burgess, ‘Performance’, 8 n 34, for ancient evidence for performance of excerpts. Performing just Book 16 would take about sixty-five minutes.
 - 5 For recent discussion of this simile, see Ledbetter, G. ‘Achilles’ Self-Address: *Iliad* 16.7–19’, *American Journal of Philology* 114.4 (1993) 481–91; Mills, S. ‘Achilles, Patroclus and Parental Care in Some Homeric Similes’, *Greece & Rome* 47.1 (2000) 3–18; Gaca, K. ‘Reinterpreting the Homeric Simile of *Iliad* 16.7–11: The Girl and her Mother in Ancient Greek Warfare’, *American Journal of Philology* 129.2 (2008) 145–71; Porter, D. ‘The Simile at *Iliad* 16.7–11 Once Again: Multiple Meanings’, *Classical World* 103.4 (2010) 447–54; Dué, C. and M. Ebbott, ‘Mothers-in-Arms: soldiers’ emotional bonds and Homeric similes’, in *War, Literature, and the Arts* 24 (2012) 1–17.
 - 6 For a broader discussion of different audiences’ knowledge of the story, see Scodel, ‘Pseudo-Intimacy’.
 - 7 Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 12.
 - 8 On the arming of Patroklos, cf. Arend, W. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer, Problemata* 7 (1933) 92–4; Armstrong, J. ‘The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*’, *American Journal Philology* 79 (1958) 337–54; Fenik, *Battle-Scenes*, 191 (with comparanda).
 - 9 For the significance of Patroklos’s inability to wield Achilles’ spear, see Fenik, *Battle-Scenes*, 191. For the significance of the spear itself, see Bannert, H. ‘Die Lanze des Patroklos’, *Wiener Studien* 18 (1984) 27–35; Grethlein, ‘Memory and Material Objects’, esp. 36–47; Shannon, R.S. *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique, Mnemosyne Supplement* 36 (1975) 31–86.
 - 10 For θεράπων, or ‘helper’, as a ‘ritual substitute’, see Nagy, G. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1979) 292, building on van Brock, N. ‘Substitution rituelle’, *Revue hittite et asianique* 65 (1959) 117–46. See also Tarenzi, V. ‘Patroclo θεράπων’, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, n.s. 80.2 (2005) 25–38, who goes further in exploring Achilles’ cult associations with sacrifice.
 - 11 See Morrison, J.V. ‘Thematic Inversion: The Greeks Under Siege’, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 35.3 (1994) 209–26, for the Greeks under siege more generally, though he does not mention this simile in his discussion. Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 352, discusses whether or not the wasps/Myrmidons are really defending *their* home, and then speaks to whether the idea of provoking wasps to swarm someone else is a ‘real’ phenomenon.

- 12 Cf. Scully, S. *Homer and the Sacred City*. (Cornell University Press, 1990) 26–7.
- 13 See Friedrich, W.-H. *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias*. (Göttingen, 1956), 114–16 for a description of the uniqueness of this battle sequence. Fenik follows to say the killings are ‘in part weird, and even fantastic’; *Typical Battle-Scenes*, 195.
- 14 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 357; cf. Armstrong, C.B. ‘The Casualty Lists in the Trojan War’, *Greece & Rome* 16.1 (1969) 30–1.
- 15 For audience response to inconsistencies in television, see Mittell, *Complex TV*, 21–2. If we leave aside *narrative* inconsistencies, we might find another analogue to the ‘haven’t I seen him before’ trope in embodied actors, who are often re-cast in various minor roles throughout a serial, without comment. Canadian actor Bill Dow, for example, played five different characters over the run of *The X-Files* (FOX, 1993–2002, 2016).
- 16 For spatial memory more generally, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*.
- 17 The reference to their father’s role in raising the Chimaira would also give a traditional audience a context for who these men are, so that through recognition, the narrative builds meaning into their deaths, without ever showing their lives. See Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 357–8, for a broader discussion of the *pathos* in this scene.
- 18 Peneleos last killed Ilioneus, in another awesomely graphic death (14.489–500).
- 19 Cf. ‘expansion’ in Edwards, ‘Homer and Oral Tradition’, 10.
- 20 *Daredevil* (Netflix, 2015–) Season 1, Episode 2. See ‘This single shot in Daredevil is the best fight scene in years’, Updated by Alex Abad-Santos, Estelle Caswell, and Joe Posner, 21 April 2015, <http://www.vox.com/2015/4/21/8461093/daredevil-hallway-fight-scene>
- 21 *Daredevil* (Netflix, 2015–) Season 2, Episode 3.
- 22 Cf. Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 362.
- 23 Janko, *Commentary*, ad loc., 362–3, notes a ring-structure in these two instances of Hektor fleeing (16.367f., 16.380–3). Cf. Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 171.
- 24 *Game of Thrones* (HBO, 2011–) Season 5, Episode 8.
- 25 Yoshida, E. ‘The Game of Game of Thrones: Season 5, Episode 8, Hardhome’, *The Verge*, 3 June 2015: <http://www.theverge.com/2015/6/3/8718347/game-of-thrones-recap-season-5-episode-8-hardhome>
- 26 Cf. Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 88 n 112.
- 27 Cf. Lateiner, D. ‘Pouring Bloody Drops (*Iliad* 16.459): The Grief of Zeus’, *Colby Quarterly* 38 (2002) 42–61, esp. 44–6.
- 28 For a discussion of heroes *as* plants in terms of their temporality, see Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 6–7.
- 29 As Clay notes, ‘the remaining Trojan leaders enumerated in Book 12’, *Trojan Theater*, 89 n 113.
- 30 I got this wrong in Kozak, L. ‘Character and Context in the Rebuke Exchange of *Iliad* 17.142–184’, *Classical World* 106.1 (2012) 1–14, 5.

- 31 The secondary characters Jory Cassel and Syrio Forel, both associated with the primary character Ned Stark (one, captain of his guard, the other, sword teacher to his daughter), both die before Ned Stark, in the first season of *Game of Thrones*: Jory in Episode 5, Syrio in Episode 8, before Ned himself is killed in Episode 9.
- 32 Cf. Scott, *Oral Nature*, 74–5, 75 n 14.
- 33 Lang, ‘Unreal conditions’, 15, singles this contrafactual out for its *pathos*: ‘... the poet seems to speak personally, like a character, and thereby involves his audience in this expression of regret and wishful thinking’.
- 34 For the narrator’s use of apostrophe with Patroklos here in Book 16, see Block, ‘The Narrator Speaks’, 16–17.
- 35 For the apostrophe here, see Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 20–1.
- 36 I have not paid nearly enough detailed attention to these contrafactuals in this present study, but it would be worth examining them further in the future, in how they are strategically similar to television’s ‘flash-sideways’ scenes and use of dream and fantasy sequences. See Burkhead, *C. Dreams in American Television Narratives: From Dallas to Buffy* (Bloomsbury, 2013); Michlin, M. ‘More, More, More: Contemporary American TV Series and the Attractions and Challenges of Serialization As Ongoing Narrative’, *Mise au Point* 3 (2011) para 8–15: <http://map.revues.org/927#tocto1n2>
- 37 For work on the appearances of Kebriones, see Bassett, S.E. ‘Hector’s Charioteer’, *Classical Philology* 15.3 (1920) 296–7;
- 38 Cf. Krischer, T. *Formale Konventionen den homerischen Epik*, *Zetemata* 56 (1971) 30, who notes that Patroklos’s *aristeia* has ended when he kills Kebriones; this slightly undermines Kyriakou’s argument that ‘16 has only two vaunts, Patroclus’ over Kebriones (745–50) and Hektor’s over Patroclus. This sparseness underscores in a very special way the double nature of the book, an account of Patroclus’ ἀριστεία and death’: Kyriakou, P. ‘Warrior Vaunts in the *Iliad*’, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* n.f. 144 (2001) 250–77, 263.
- 39 Cf. Lynn-George, M. ‘Aspects of the Epic Vocabulary of Vulnerability’, *Colby Quarterly* 29.3 (1993) 197–221, 9–10, on this οὐδέ ... χραΐσμησεν construction and Achilles’ responsibility in Patroklos’s death.
- 40 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 291, perhaps rightly rejects a break here, because it separates Patroklos’s death from that of Euphorbos; Edwards, M. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume V: books 17–20* (Cambridge, 1991) ad loc., 63, gives another reason to want to keep going over this book-break: ‘The present book-division obscures the diversion of our attention from Hektor, glorying in victory and pursuing his victim’s horses (16.864–7), to the struggle for the body of Patroklos.’
- 41 This strategy combines Rengakos’s two categories of ‘Tension-strategies’ (Spannungsstrategien), of gradual clarification (‘A’, die schrittweise Präzisierung) and of exploiting knowledge gaps between characters (‘C’, die aus dem Gegensatz

- zwischen Wissen des Rezipienten und Nicht-Wissen der im Epos auftretenden Personen), ‘Spannungsstrategien’, 310.
- 42 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 90–5.
- 43 For a full discussion of the narrator’s ability to move ‘backwards’ in time, though she does not mention this passage, see Scodel, R. ‘Zielinski’s Law Reconsidered’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138 (2008) 107–25.
- 44 Scodel, ‘Zielinski’s law’, 110.
- 45 Segal, *Theme of Mutilation*, 21, for this scene.
- 46 See Mills, S. ‘Achilles, Patroclus and Parental Care in Some Homeric Similes’, *Greece & Rome* 47.1 (2000) 3–18, 9–10, for a discussion of this simile.
- 47 See Lynn-George, M. ‘Structures of Care in the *Iliad*’, *Classical Quarterly* 46.1 (1996), 4.
- 48 For contrary parallelism in a beat-switch, see Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 115.
- 49 See Lardinois, A. ‘Characterization through *gnomai* in Homer’s *Iliad*’, *Mnemosyne* 53.6 (2000) 641–61, 645, who sees this gnomic statement as characteristic of Achilles, cf. 18.328.
- 50 Cf. Paris 13.777.
- 51 Cf. Scholia AbT ad 17.206 (Erbse); see Edwards, *Commentary*, ad loc., 82.
- 52 See Edwards, *Commentary*, ad loc. 17.260, 88, for a discussion of this ‘inexpressibility *topos*’ used here not to initiate a catalogue (cf. 2.484–93) but to break one off.
- 53 Cunningham, A. ‘*Game of Thrones*’ sixth season provided what the show sorely needed: Motion’, *Ars Technica*, 27 June 2016: <http://arstechnica.com/the-multiverse/2016/06/game-of-thrones-sixth-season-provided-what-the-show-sorely-needed-motion/>
- 54 Lang, ‘Unreal Conditions’, 14, calls this a ‘pseudo-condition of Type A and B’, and notes its rare function in marking a shift from Greek fortune to Trojan fortune in battle, as well as its shared apodosis with 6.74f. See also de Jong, *Narrators*, 73–4 for discussion of this conditional.
- 55 Cf. Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 109: ‘Physically, the narrator has the ability to move at will and instantaneously to any location.’
- 56 Cf. Segal, C. ‘Andromache’s *Anagnōrīsis*: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437–476’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75 (1971) 33–57, 36–7, for the *Iliad*’s similar artistry in building up to Andromache’s response to Hektor’s death. Cf. Rengakos, ‘Spannungsstrategien’, 310, for this strategy more generally.
- 57 For the strategy of these anonymous speeches here, see de Jong, ‘The Voice of Anonymity’, 71–2.
- 58 For this image as an essential contrast between mortality and immortality, see Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 33–6.

- 59 For a discussion of the horses' role in Book 17, see Schein, S. 'The Horses of Achilles in Book 17 of the *Iliad*', in *Homeric Epic and its Reception* (Oxford, 2016) 11–26.
- 60 For a discussion of charioteers who 'take the hit' for Hektor, see Nagy, G. 'A Failed Understudy for the Role of Chariot Fighter: the Case of Koiranos, the King Who Never Was', *Classical Inquiries*, 15 May 2015: <http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/a-failed-understudy-for-the-role-of-chariot-fighter-the-case-of-koiranos-the-king-who-never-was/>
- 61 Cf. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 291, who argues against a break between Books 17 and 18: 'The scene between Achilles and Thetis (18.35–147) is a crucial episode, but it should not be sectioned off from what goes before. The arrival of Antilochos at 18.1ff. is tightly linked to his dispatch at 17.651–701; and the battle which is left at 17.761 is tightly bound to its resumption at 18.3148ff.'
- 62 Edwards, *Commentary*, ad loc., 115.
- 63 See Edwards, *Commentary*, ad loc., 127, for a discussion of the extraordinary way that this passage defines Patroklos.
- 64 Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 36, sees this as an instance of 'local motivation', where it is odd that 'Achilles did not think of it earlier.'
- 65 Cf. Minchin, 'Communicating without words', for gestures as particularly 'memorable.'
- 66 Compare Andromache's mourning for Hektor while he is still alive (6.500–2); on Patroklos's death prefiguring Achilles' own death, see Burgess, J. 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *Classical Antiquity* 14.2 (1995) 217–44, 231.
- 67 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', 10, lists this conditional as 'Type A', as it has an apodosis that is both contrafactual and against fate.
- 68 Segal, *Theme of Mutilation*, 72, for discussion of this passage as a 'climax' in the theme of corpse mutilation.
- 69 For discussion of the simile descriptions of Achilles through this passage, see Segal, *Theme of Mutilation*, 42–3, with further bibliography in 43 n 1, Edwards, *Commentary*, 170–2.
- 70 Cf. Clark, 'Poulydamas and Hektor', 94–8, for a full discussion of this exchange, including the characterization of Poulydamas and the 'doubling' of the two men.
- 71 Cf. Clark, 'Poulydamas and Hektor', 98; Schofield, 'Euboulia', 20.
- 72 Cf. Mills, 'Parental Care', 9.
- 73 There is possible confusion here over what armour Achilles promises Patroklos's corpse here, whether Hektor's own, or Achilles', which Hektor has been wearing: Edwards argues that this indicates integration of traditional material into a new poem. Cf. Edwards, M.W., 'Neanalysis and Beyond', *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990) 311–25, 321.
- 74 Cf. Lardinois, 'Characterization through *gnomai*', 656–7.

- 75 Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 39, makes note of Thetis's part in Hephaistos's rescue being different at 1.586–94.
- 76 For this kind of wish, cf. Hektor at 8.538–41; for discussion of this wish, see Combellack, 'The Wish without Desire', 117.
- 77 Cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 82–3 on the immortality of the armour contrasting Achilles' mortality.
- 78 For a full discussion Taplin, O. 'The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*', *Greece & Rome* 27.1 (1980) 1–21. Taplin calls the Shield 'the calm before the storm' (1), drawing attention to its 'joys of civilization and fertility' (2).
- 79 Cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 36–7. For Thetis' immortal grief, cf. 24.105. See n 147.
- 80 See Scully, S. 'Reading the Shield of Achilles: Terror, Anger, Delight', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101 (2003) 29–47, for a discussion of responses to Achilles' armour.
- 81 *Ibid.*, 33–6, for an in-depth discussion of the Achaian response to Achilles' armour.
- 82 On the preservation of Patroklos's corpse, cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, Chapter 2, esp. 74–82.
- 83 Clay, *Trojan Theater*, 44–5.
- 84 For this speech and how it fits into Agamemnon's larger story arc, see Rabel, R. 'Agamemnon's *Iliad*', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 32.2 (1991) 103–17, esp. 113–17.
- 85 These gestures play on the memorability of the scene for any audience (cf. Minchin, 'Communicating Without Words'), but would resonate more with audiences who would recognize their ritual meaning for mourning. Cf. Alexiou, M. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. (Oxford, 1974) 6, 8, 10, 18, 21, 28–9, 32–3, 41, 55–6, 68–9, 207 n 27. Cf. Pucci, P. 'Antiphonal Lament Between Achilles and Briseis', *Colby Quarterly* 29.3 (1993) 258–72, esp. 258 for ritual elements.
- 86 This dynamic does not rely on Briseis having a history outside of the *Iliad*, but of course knowing her place in tradition would create a different experience for different audiences. For a full account of Briseis in tradition, see Dué, C. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*. (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).
- 87 On Achilles' talking horses, and their connection with Achilles' mortality, cf. Heath, J. *The Talking Greeks: Speech, Animals, and the Other in Homer, Aeschylus, and Plato*. (Cambridge, 2005), 39–40; cf. Schein, 'Horses', 20.
- 88 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 292, says that 'this is a perfectly reasonable place for a minor division.' Taplin does not define what a 'minor division' would mean in terms of performance: would it be a short break?
- 89 By this point, we have already seen some major character curtain calls, like Glaukos's final exchange with Hektor in Book 17: Glaukos makes his last appearance at 17.216.
- 90 This is the only occasion where the narrator addresses Achilles.

- 91 Block, 'Narrator Speaks', 16, says that 'with the apparent exception of Melanippos and Achilles in the *Iliad*, those so addressed – Menelaos, Patroklos, Eumaios – exhibit characteristic traits of vulnerability, loyalty, and a vague but poetically essential weakness.' These 'characteristic traits' might all be applied to Achilles here, as he goes into battle, faced with his own mortality, on behalf of his dead companion.
- 92 For interaction between this passage and tradition, see Burgess, J. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. (Johns Hopkins, 2011) 90.
- 93 Cf. Burgess, *Tradition*, 247 n 70, for references to Achilles' raid on Aineias's cattle. See also Walcot, P. 'Cattle Raiding, Heroic Tradition, and Ritual: The Greek Evidence', *History of Religions* 78.4 (1979) 326–51, 330.
- 94 Block, 'Narrator Speaks', 11–12 n 19; Yamagata, 'Apostrophe', 94–7 on apostrophe to Apollo.
- 95 See Nagy, *Best of Achaeans*, Chapter 15, for an extended discussion of the traditions of Achilles and Aineias coming into play in this scene.
- 96 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', 10, names this a 'Type A' condition, something that would have been 'beyond fate'.
- 97 See Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 140–50, for an extended discussion of this scene, tradition, and audience knowledge.
- 98 Torrance, 'Oaths of the Gods', 201–2, for Hera and swearing, including her mention of oaths here.
- 99 For Achilles' connection to fire and this epanalepsis, see Edwards, *Commentary*, ad loc., 331.
- 100 Cf. Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 45–6.
- 101 Cf. de Jong, 'Homer', 20.
- 102 Cf. Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 17; Tsagalis, *Listeners to Viewers*, 84.
- 103 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 292, calls this 'the least acceptable of all of "Aristarchos" divisions'.
- 104 de Jong, 'Homer', 27–8, sees this Lykaon scene, rightly, as combining prolepses and analepses to great affect.
- 105 Segal, *Theme of Mutilation*, 30–2; cf. Lynn-George, M. 'Structures of Care', 1–26, 1.
- 106 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', 13, labels this condition a 'Type C', suggesting indefinite continuation of killing without intervention.
- 107 See Burgess, J. 'Untrustworthy Apollo and the Destiny of Achilles: *Iliad* 24.55–63', 33; Burgess, *Death and Afterlife*, 53, for discussion of Thetis's prophecy.
- 108 Cf. Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection*, 134 n 40: 'Even in book 21, Hector continues to be foremost in Achilles' thoughts'.
- 109 For the irony and humour in this scene, see Bell, R. 'Homer's Humor: Laughter in the *Iliad*', *Humanitas* 20.1–2 (2007) 96–116, esp. 114; cf. Sikes, E.E. 'The Humour of Homer', *Classical Review* 54.3 (1940) 121–7, 123; Seeskin, K.R. 'The Comedy of the Gods in the *Iliad*', *Philosophy and Literature* 1.3 (1977) 295–306.

- 110 Cf. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 292.
- 111 Chruściak, I. 'Nonverbal Behaviour of Characters in the *Iliad* as a Form of Prolepsis,' *Græco-Latin Brunensia* 20.2 (2015) 17–31, esp. 20–2.
- 112 Cf. Anderson, M.J. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. (Oxford, 1997) 31.
- 113 See Burgess, *Tradition*, 65–6, 215–16 n 67, for the debate about Astyanax's death as pre-*Iliad* or not.
- 114 *Ibid.*, 248 n 83, for Priam's fate.
- 115 See n 107.
- 116 Cf. Cairns, D. 'Honour and shame: modern controversies and ancient values,' *Critical Quarterly* 53.1 (2011) 23–41, 36–8; Clark, 'Poulydamas and Hektor,' 98–101.
- 117 de Jong, 'Voice of Anonymity,' 265.
- 118 Cf. Scodel, 'Theory of Mind'.
- 119 For this conflation between sex and battle, we might look to the other two instances of ὀαριστῦς; at 13.291 in reference to the huddle of the frontline fighters, in the conversation between Idomeneus and Meriones; the only other reference is at 14.216, where the 'conversations' of lovers are ensconced on Hera's zone in her seduction scene with Zeus.
- 120 This is the most detailed landscape description in the *Iliad*: cf. Treu, M. *Von Homer zur Lyrik*. (Beck, 1955) 87–101, esp. 91–3, and the image of peace-time activities in the description of the landscape (twin sources of the river Scamander, the washing tubs, etc.) are all focalized through Hektor (cf. Fenik, B. 'Stylization and Variety: Four Monologues in the *Iliad*,' in *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, B. Fenik, ed. (Brill, 1978) 68–90, 85; de Jong, I. *Homer: Iliad Book XXII*. (Cambridge, 2012) 97. The contrast between war and peace increases the horror of Hektor's imminent demise (cf. Schadewaldt, W. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. 4th edn. (Koehler, 1965) 149; Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik*, 93), while the place-setting marks the precise spot where Hektor will face Achilles and die (*Iliad* 22.208–9; cf. Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik*, 94.
- 121 Cf. Minchin, 'Scripts,' 235 n 29.
- 122 Cf. Rengakos, 'Spannungsstrategien,' 323–4.
- 123 I agree with Rutherford that this is a 'recognition,' but I do not agree with his assessment of Hektor's character for it. See Rutherford, 'Tragic Form and Feeling,' 157.
- 124 Cf. Burgess, *Death and Afterlife*, 27–42.
- 125 We can compare this to Odysseus's own offer to Achilles during the embassy, where he says that the Achaians will honour Achilles like a god (9.302).
- 126 Cf. Alexiou, *Ritual Lament*; Minchin, 'Communicating without words'.
- 127 Cf. Mueller, *The Iliad*, 37.
- 128 See Anderson, *Fall of Troy*, for a discussion of Troy's fall in the epic cycle beyond the *Iliad*.

- 129 Cf. de Jong, ‘Homer’ in *Time*, 35, ‘epic regression’; Scodel, ‘Zielinski’s Law’, for general discussions of time moving backwards in the epic.
- 130 For the best analysis of this scene, see Segal, ‘Andromache’s *Anagnōrīsis*’.
- 131 I love Grethlein’s reading of this scene, both for his precise temporal analyses, but also for the suggestion that Hektor’s bath serves as a proleptic symbol for washing his corpse that creates anticipation for that scene. Grethlein, J. ‘The Poetics of the Bath in the *Iliad*’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103 (2007) 25–49. See also Segal, ‘Andromache’s *Anagnōrīsis*’, 42.
- 132 See Spatafora, G. ‘Esigenza fisiologica e funzione terapeutica del lamento nei poemi omerici (studio sul significato di κλαίω, γοάω, στένω, οἰμώζω/κωκύω, οδυρομαι)’, *L’Antiquité Classique* 66 (1997) 1–23, for a full discussion of this verb’s use in women’s lament scenes. Cf. Thetis at 18.37, 18.71; Briseis at 19.284; Hekabe will be described with this verb again at 24.200 and Cassandra at 24.703.
- 133 Cf. Segal, ‘Andromache’s *Anagnōrīsis*’, 53–7, for discussion of Andromache’s ‘heroic death’.
- 134 On Andromache’s diadem prefiguring the fall of Troy, cf. Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 125–9; for the diadem as a callback to Hektor and Andromache’s wedding, see Grethlein, ‘Memory and Material Objects’, 42.
- 135 For proleptic references to Astyanax’s death, see Burgess, J. ‘The Hypertext of Astyanax’, in *Trends in Classics Vol. 2 No. 2*, eds A. Rengakos and F. Montanari (de Gruyter, 2010) 211–24.
- 136 Cf. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches*, 20–1.
- 137 This ‘future’ can be seen in the elliptical use of πρὶν at 23.190, (μὴ πρὶν μένος ἠέλιος/ σκῆλαι’); cf. 24.800 and see Macleod, C. *Homer: Iliad, Book XXIV* (Cambridge, 1982) 17, 17 n 1, and Richardson, N. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 6, Books 21–24* (Cambridge, 1993), ad loc. 184–91, 190.
- 138 See Hinckley, L.V. ‘Patroclus’ Funeral Games and Homer’s Character Portrayal’, *The Classical Journal* 81.3 (1986) 209–21; de Jong, ‘Homer’ in *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*, 19.
- 139 See Nünlist, R. ‘Nestor and Speaking Silence in the *Iliad*’, *Philologus* 156 (2012) 150–56, 150 for an account of the length of Nestor’s speeches.
- 140 Cf. Macleod, *Iliad* 24, 30.
- 141 See Kozak, ‘Oaths’, 63.
- 142 West, M.L. ‘The Rise of the Epic’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988) 151–72, 158–9, points towards the conflict between Aias and Odysseus as a dating back to the Mycenaean period.
- 143 See Purves, A. ‘Falling into Time in Homer’s *Iliad*’, *Classical Antiquity* 25.1 (2006) 179–209, 186 n 23, notes how the falling here and in the wrestling match mirrors earlier, lethal, falling in battle, now ‘winding down’.
- 144 See Richardson, *Commentary*, ad loc., 263.

- 145 Cf. *Ibid.*, ad 23.836–8, 264.
- 146 Cf. Garland, R. ‘The Causation of Death in the *Iliad*: A Theological and Biological Investigation’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28.1 (1981) 43–60, esp. 47, on formulae with *thumos* in death scenes in the *Iliad*.
- 147 See Davies, M. ‘The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book 24’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101 (1981) 56–62, for a full discussion of this passage. Cf. Mackie, C.J. ‘*Iliad* 24 and the Judgement of Paris’, *Classical Quarterly* 63.1 (2013) 1–16.
- 148 Macleod, *Iliad* 24, 86, notes that ‘the description of one night merges into a series of nights’.
- 149 For the ‘local motivation’ of this relationship, see Scodel, *Credible Impossibilities*, 39.
- 150 In that time, she has comforted Achilles, gone to Hephaistos’s house to get the armor, delivered the armor to Achilles, preserved Patroklos’s corpse, and urged Achilles’ horses to mourning.
- 151 For a discussion of the ‘unforgettable grief’, see Nagy, *Best of Achaeans*, Chapter 6; For this formula, cf. *Odyssey* 1.342; Hesiod, *Theogony* 467; *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 207.
- 152 For a discussion of this divine feeling of time, see Garcia, *Homeric Durability*, 90.
- 153 Cf. n 128; see Spatafora, ‘Esigenza fisiologica’, 11.
- 154 Hekabe has lost her son; Achilles grieves Patroklos ‘like a son’; cf. 23.217–25, and is implicitly accused of lamenting Patroklos like a son when Achilles complains about his grief at 24.46f. For the theme of cannibalism as a sign of extreme grief and rage (cf. 4.34–6; 22.345–54), see Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, 19–21; Buchan, M. ‘Achilles and the Cyclops’, in *Eating Their Words: Cannibalism and the Boundaries of Cultural Identity*, ed. K. Guest (SUNY Press, 2001) 11–34.
- 155 For a general discussion of similes and ‘memorability’, see Minchin, ‘Similes in Homer’.
- 156 See Davies, ‘Judgement of Paris’, 60, for a discussion of Homer and Troilus in tradition. Cf. Mackie, ‘*Iliad* 24’, 7–8.
- 157 For the gestures throughout this scene between Achilles and Priam, see Lateiner, *Sardonic Smile*, 31–43.
- 158 Taplin, ‘Shield of Achilles’, 14 and 20 n 34, for the wealth of Troy as an Iliadic motif.
- 159 For performance-time and story-time, see Grethlein, J. ‘The Narrative Reconfiguration of Time Beyond Ricoeur’, *Poetics Today* 31.2 (2010) 313–29.
- 160 For a discussion of the Niobe story, see Alden, *Homer Beside Himself*, 27–9.
- 161 Achilles has slept (23.231–4), eaten in funeral banquets with the Myrmidons (23.29) and the Greek captains (23.48), and eaten alone in his tent (24. 475–6), before finally eating with Priam here (24.621–8). Seaford, R. *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford, 1994) 160, suggests that the multiplicity of funerary banquets with Achilles may have arisen ‘out of the desire to exploit the integrating power of the funeral feast, in the reconciliations of Achilles with the Greek leaders and even with

- Priam. On Achilles' return to human rituals of food, sleep, and sex, see Macleod, *Iliad* 24, 142; cf. Lynn-George 'Structures of Care', 14.
- 162 For the gesture of the wrist-grab, cf. 18.594 dancing men and women; 21.489 Leto and Artemis; 24.671 here. See Lateiner, *Sardonic Smile*, 57.
- 163 For parallels between Books 1 and 24, see Stanley, *Shield of Homer*, 241–7.
- 164 Cf. Mackie, C.J. '*Iliad* 24', 11–12.
- 165 For the role of Cassandra in these stories, see Dué, C. *The Captive Women's Lament in Greek Tragedy* (University of Texas, 2006) 143–5.
- 166 Lang, 'Unreal Conditions', 13, classifies this as a 'Type C' conditional, where an emotion would have continued without intervention.
- 167 We can contrast this use of μέλιχος with those descriptions of Patroklos once he died (cf. 17.671; 19.300): but Andromache is specific about Hektor not being 'gentle' in battle, where no such qualification is applied to Patroklos.
- 168 For Kakridis's 'ascending scale of affection', first discussed by in *Homeric Researches* (Gleerup, 1949), in this scene, see Alden, *Homer Beside Himself*, 241–2; cf. Pantelia, M.C. 'Helen and the Last Song for Hector', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132.1–2 (2002) 21–7.
- 169 Traditionally, the *Odyssey* has several allusions to arrows from Apollo or Artemis meaning an easy death: cf. 3.279–80, 5.123–4, 11.172–3, 11.198–9, 15.410–11. But here, so soon after Achilles' Niobe story, and the parallel actions of mothers mourning sons, this description holds different layers.
- 170 For Helen's role in Hektor's funeral, see Pantelia, 'Helen'; cf. Roisman, H. 'Helen in the *Iliad*, *Causa Belli* and Victim of War', *American Journal of Philology* 127.1 (2006) 1–36, 28–32.
- 171 Cf. Pantelia, 'Helen', 24–5.

Conclusion: Reruns

- 1 Jaramillo, D. in Hilmes, M., C. Huber, D. Jaramillo, A. Martin, D. Milch, A. Nayman, M. Zoller Seitz, C. Sharrett, A. Taubin and B. Willimon, 'Rethinking Television', *Cineaste* 39.4 (2014) 26–38, 29.
- 2 Young, C., 'Don't Root for the *Game of Thrones* White Walkers Just Yet', *Time*, 17 June 2015: <http://time.com/3924156/game-of-thrones-white-walkers/>
- 3 Sullivan, K.P. 'How "Star Trek" Was Simon Pegg's Ultimate Fan Dream', *MTV News*, 12 September 2013, <http://www.mtv.com/news/1713966/simon-pegg-star-trek-into-darkness/>
- 4 Trendacosta, K. 'Simon Pegg Got Help from the *Star Trek* Fan Wiki while Writing *Star Trek Beyond*', *Gizmodo*, 19 April 2016. <http://io9.gizmodo.com/simon-pegg-got-help-from-the-star-trek-fan-wiki-while-w-1771866467>

- 5 Fuller, B., quoted in A. Pappademas, 'Q&A: Bryan Fuller on the End (for Now) of "Hannibal," the Future of Broadcast TV, and His Plans for Clarice Starling,' *Grantland*, 31 August 2015, <http://grantland.com/hollywood-prospectus/qa-bryan-fuller-on-the-end-for-now-of-hannibal-the-future-of-broadcast-tv-and-his-plans-for-clarice-starling/>
- 6 Kahane, A. 'Fan fiction, early Greece, and the historicity of canon,' *Transformative Works and Cultures* 21 (2016) <http://journal.transformativeworks.org/index.php/twc/article/view/681/553>

Works Cited

- Abad-Santos, A. (2016), 'Negan has finally arrived on The Walking Dead. Here's why he's so important.' *vox.com*, 3 April. Available online: <http://www.vox.com/2016/4/3/11353504/walking-dead-negan>
- Adams, E. (2015) 'Game of Thrones (newbies): "Hardhome"', *A. V. Club*, 31 May. Available online: <http://www.avclub.com/tvclub/game-thrones-newbies-hardhome-220153>
- Ahl, F. (1989), 'Homer, Vergil, and complex narrative structures in Latin epic: an essay', *Illinois Classical Studies*, 14 (1/2): 1–31.
- Alden, M. (2000), *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexiou, M. (1974), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, R. C. (2004), 'Making Sense of Soaps', in *The Television Studies Reader*, eds R. C. Hill and Annette Hill, Routledge.
- Anderson, M.J. (1997), *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Arend, W.A. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer, Problemata 7*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Armstrong, C.B. (1969), 'The Casualty Lists in the Trojan War', *Greece and Rome* 16: 30–31.
- Armstrong, J. (1958), 'The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*', *American Journal of Philology* 79: 337–54.
- Arthur, M.B. 9 (1981), 'The divided world of *Iliad* VI', *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 8, (1–2): 21–46.
- Bakker, E.J. (1993), 'Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization, and "Presence" in Homeric Poetry', *Classical Antiquity* 12:1–29.
- Bakker, E.J. (1999) 'How Oral is Oral Composition?', in E. Mackay (ed.), *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. E. Mackay, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 188: 29–48.
- Bannert, H. (1984), 'Die Lanze des Patroklos', *Wiener Studien* 18: 27–35.
- Bassett, S E. (1920), 'Hector's Charioteer', *Classical Philology* 15: 296–297.
- Beck, D. (2008), 'Character-quoted speech in the *Iliad*', *Phoenix* 62.1–2: 162–83.
- Bell, R. (2007), 'Homer's Humor: Laughter in the *Iliad*', *Humanitas* 20.1–2: 96–116.
- Bernadete, S. (2005) *Achilles and Hector: The Homeric Hero*. South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press.
- Bernsdorff, H. (1992), *Zur Rolle des Aussehens im homerischen Menschenbild*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Beveridge, A. and J. Shan (2016), 'Network of Thrones', *Math Horizons*, April: 18–22.
- Beye, C.R. (1964), 'Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68: 345–373.
- Bile, M. and J. Klein (2007), 'Hector et les principaux personnages féminins de l'Iliade', *Gaia: revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce Archaïque* 11 (1): 121–127.
- Block, E. (1982), 'The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112: 7–22.
- Bonifazi, A. (2008), 'Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers', in E. Anne Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World, Orality an Literacy in Ancient Greece, Volume 7*, Leiden: Brill, 35–64.
- Booth, P. (2012), 'The Television Social Network: Exploring TV Characters', *Communication Studies* 63.3: 309–27.
- Bordwell, D. (1985), *Narration in the fiction film*, University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bowman, J. (2001) 'Mob Hit' *The American Spectator*, 1 May. Available online: <http://www.jamesbowman.net/articleDetail.asp?pubID=1437>
- Bowra, C.M. (1930), *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bradley, E.M. (1967), 'Hector and the Simile of the Snowy Mountain', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98: 37–41.
- Brown, H.P. (2003) 'The Pragmatics of Direct Address in the *Iliad*: A Study in Linguistic Politeness', Ohio State University Dissertation.
- Brunius-Nilsson, E. (1955), *Δαιμόνιαι: an inquiry into a mode of apostrophe in old Greek literature*. Uppsala.
- Buchan, M. (2001), 'Achilles and the Cyclops', in K. Guest (ed.), *Eating Their Words: Cannibalism and the Boundaries of Cultural Identity*, 11–34, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Buchan, M. (2004) *The Limits of Heroism: Homer and the Ethics of Reading*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Burgess, J.S. (1995), 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *Classical Antiquity* 14.2: 217–44.
- Burgess, J.S. (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burgess, J.S. (2004), 'Performance and the Epic Cycle', *Classical Journal* 100: 1–23.
- Burgess, J.S. (2010), 'The Hypertext of Astyanax', in eds A. Rengakos and F. Montanari, *Trends in Classics Vol. 2 No. 2*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 211–24.
- Burgess, J.S. (2011), *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burkhead, C. (2013), *Dreams in American Television Narratives: From Dallas to Buffy*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Cairns, D. (1993), *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cairns, D. (2011), 'Honour and shame: modern controversies and ancient values', *Critical Quarterly* 53.1: 23–41.

- Cairns, D. (2015), 'The Horror and the Pity: *Phrikē* as a Tragic Emotion', *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 35 (1): 75–94.
- Callaway, C. (1993), 'Perjury and the Unsworn Oath', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123:15–26.
- Chatman, S. (1978), *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Chruściak, I. (2015), 'Nonverbal Behaviour of Characters in the *Iliad* as a Form of Prolepsis', *Græco-Latin Brunensia* 20.2: 17–31.
- Ciani, M.G. (1963–1964), 'Le morti minori nell'*Iliade*', *Atti/Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 122: 403–415.
- Clark, M. (2001) 'The Concept of Plot and Plot in the *Iliad*', *Phoenix* 55.1–2: 1–8.
- Clark, M. (2007), 'Poulydamas and Hektor', *College Literature* 34.2: 85–106.
- Clark, M. (2004), 'Formula, Metre, and Type-Scenes', in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 117–38.
- Clarke, M. (2004), 'Manhood and heroism', in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 74–90.
- Clay, J.S. (2011), *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, D. (1998) *Immortal Armor: The Concept of Alkē in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Collins, L. (1988), *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad*, Frankfurt: Athenäum-Verlag.
- Combella, F. (1944), 'Homer and Hector', *American Journal of Philology* 65.3: 209–43.
- Combella, F.M. (1981), 'The Wish without Desire', *American Journal of Philology* 102: 115–119.
- Cook, E. F. (2009), 'On the "Importance" of *Iliad* Book 8', *Classical Philology* 104 (2): 133–161.
- Crossett, J. (1969), 'The Art of Homer's Catalogue of Ships', *Classical Journal* 64.4: 241–5.
- Culpepper, J. (2009), 'Reflections on a stylistic approach to characterisation' in G. Brône and J. Vandaele (eds), *Cognitive Poetics: goals, gains, gaps*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 125–59.
- Cunliffe, R.J. (1924), *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*, London: Blackie and Son Ltd.
- Cunningham, A. (2016) '*Game of Thrones*' sixth season provided what the show sorely needed: Motion', *Ars Technica*, 27 June. Available online: <http://arstechnica.com/the-multiverse/2016/06/game-of-thrones-sixth-season-provided-what-the-show-sorely-needed-motion/>
- Danek, G. (1988), *Studien zur Dolonie*. Vienna: Verl. der Österr. Akad. der Wiss.
- Davies, M. (1981), 'The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book 24', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101: 56–62.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1985), '*Iliad* 1.366–392: A Mirror Story', *Arethusa* 18 (1): 5–22.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, 2nd edn, Amsterdam: Duckworth.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987), 'Paris/ Alexandros in the *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 60: 124–7.

- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987), 'The voice of anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*', *Eranos* 85: 69–84.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1994) 'Between word and deed: hidden thoughts in the *Odyssey*' in I.J.F. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan (eds), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature, Mnemosyne Supplement* 130, Leiden: Brill, 27–50.
- de Jong, I.J.F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2007) 'Homer' in I.J.F. de Jong and René Nünlist (eds), *Time in Ancient Greek Narrative: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative Volume 2*, Leiden: Brill, 15–37.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2012), *Homer: Iliad Book XXII*, Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- de Jong, I.J.F., and R. Nünlist (2004), 'From Bird's Eye View to Close Up: The Standpoint of the Narrator in the Homeric Epics', in A. Bierl, A. Schmitt, A. Willi and J. Latacz (eds), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, Munchen: Saur, 63–83.
- de Romilly, J. (1997), *Hector*, Paris: Editions de Fallois.
- De Temmerman, K. (2014), *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dietrich, B.C. (1964), 'The Judgment of Zeus', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 107.2: 97–125.
- Donlan, W. (1970), 'Character Structure in Homer's *Iliad*', *Journal of General Education* 21 (4): 259–269.
- Donlan, W. (1989), 'The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy', *Phoenix* 43.1: 1–15.
- Dowling, A. (2014) 'Why *Sons of Anarchy*'s Excruciating Long Episodes are Ruining the Show', *Indiewire*, 11 November. Available online: <http://www.indiewire.com/article/why-sons-of-anarchys-excruciatingly-long-episodes-are-ruining-the-show-20141111>
- Duban J.M. (1981), 'Les duels majeurs de l'*Illiade* et le langage d'Hector', *Les Études Classiques* 49: 97–124.
- Du , C. (2002), *Homeric Variations on Lament by Briseis*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Du , C. (2006), *The Captive Women's Lament in Greek Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Du , C. (2012) 'Maneuvers in the Dark of Night: *Iliad* 10 in the Twenty-First Century' in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds), *Homeric Contexts: Neanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*: 175–83.
- Du , C. and M. Ebbot (2010), *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush*, Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Du , C. and M. Ebbott (2012), 'Mothers-in-Arms: soldiers' emotional bonds and Homeric similes', in *War, Literature, and the Arts* 24, 1–17.
- Dupont, F. (1991), *Hom re et Dallas: Introduction   une critique anthropologique*, Paris: Hachette.
- Eco, U. (1985), 'Innovation and Repetition: Between Modern and Post-Modern Aesthetics', *Daedalus* 114 (4): 161–84.
- Eder, J., Jannidis, F., and R. Schneider (2010), 'Characters in Fictional Worlds: An Introduction', in J. Eder, F. Jannidis, and R. Schneider (eds), *Characters in Fictional*

- Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film and Other Media* (Revisionen: Grundbegriffe der Literaturtheorie 3), 3–60, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Edwards, A.T. (1984), 'Aristos Achaiōn: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the *Iliad*', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* n.s. 17.2: 61–80.
- Edwards, M.W. (1975), 'Type-scenes and Homeric Hospitality', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 105: 51–72.
- Edwards, M.W. (1990), 'Neoanalysis and Beyond', *Classical Antiquity* 9: 311–52.
- Edwards, M.W. (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume V: Books 17–20*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, M.W. (1992), 'Homer and Oral Tradition: the Type-Scene', *Oral Tradition* 7/2: 284–330.
- Edwards, M.W. (2004), *Sense, Sound and Rhythm: Listening to Greek and Latin Poetry*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Elmer, D. (2008), 'Epikoinos: The Ball Game *Episkuros* and *Iliad* 12.421–23', *Classical Philology* 103: 414–23.
- Epstein, A. (2006), *Crafty TV Writing: Thinking Inside The Box*, New York: Holt.
- Erbse H. (1969–88). *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Erbse, H. (1970), 'Zeus und Here auf dem Idagebirge', *Antike und Abendland* 16.2: 93–112.
- Erbse, H. (1978), 'Ettore nell'*Iliade*', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 27: 13–34.
- Farron, S. (1978), 'The character of Hector in the *Iliad*', *Acta Classica* 21: 39–57.
- Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle-Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technique of Homeric Battle Descriptions*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Fenik, B. (1978), 'Stylization and Variety: Four Monologues in the *Iliad*', in B. Fenik, (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, Leiden: Brill, 68–90.
- Fineberg, S. (1999) 'Blind Rage and Eccentric Vision in *Iliad* 6', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129: 13–41.
- Fiske, J. (2002), *Television Culture*, London: Taylor and Francis.
- Fiske, S. T., M. Lin and S. L. Neuberg (1999), 'The Continuum Model: Ten Years Later', in S. Chaiken and Y. Trope (eds), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology*, 234–54, New York: Guilford Press.
- Ford, A. (1994) *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Friedrich, W.-H. (1956), *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias*, Göttingen, 114–16.
- Fuller, B. (2015), quoted in A. Pappademas, 'Q&A: Bryan Fuller on the End (for Now) of "Hannibal," the Future of Broadcast TV, and His Plans for Clarice Starling', *Grantland*, 31 August, <http://grantland.com/hollywood-prospectus/qa-bryan-fuller-on-the-end-for-now-of-hannibal-the-future-of-broadcast-tv-and-his-plans-for-clarice-starling/>
- Gaca, K. (2008), 'Reinterpreting the Homeric Simile of *Iliad* 16.7–11: The Girl and her Mother in Ancient Greek Warfare', *American Journal of Philology* 129.2: 145–71.
- Gaertner, J.F. (2001), 'The Homeric Catalogues and Their Function in Epic Narrative', *Hermes* 129.3: 298–305.

- Garcia, L.F. Jr. (2013), *Homeric Durability: Telling Time in the Iliad*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Garland, R. (1981), 'The Causation of Death in the *Iliad*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28: 43–60.
- Gill, C. (1991), 'The Character-Personality Distinction', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Character and Individuality in Greek Literature*, 1–31, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Golden, L. (1989), 'Διὸς ἀπάτη and the Unity of *Iliad* 14', *Mnemosyne* 42.1: 1–11.
- Gopnick, A. (2015) 'A Point of View: How much longer can sprawling TV box sets get?' *BBC Magazine*, 7 August. Available online: <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-33804184>
- Gray, J. and J. Mittell (2007), 'Speculation on Spoilers: *Lost* Fandom, Narrative Consumption and Rethinking Textuality', *Participations* 4 (1): 1–46.
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2010), *Homer: Iliad Book VI*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Grethlein, J. (2006), *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias: eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive*. *Hypomnemata* 163. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Grethlein, J. (2007), 'The Poetics of the Bath in the *Iliad*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103: 25–49.
- Grethlein, J. (2008), 'Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 128: 27–51.
- Grethlein, J. (2010), 'The Narrative Reconfiguration of Time Beyond Ricoeur', *Poetics Today* 31.2: 313–29.
- Griffin, J. (1976), 'Homeric Pathos and Objectivity', *Classical Quarterly* 26 (2): 161–87.
- Griffin, J. (1980), *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Griffin, J. (1986), 'Homeric Words and Speakers', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 36–57.
- Guxens, A. (2012), 'George R.R. Martin: "Trying to please everyone is a horrible mistake"', *Adria's News*, 7 October. Available online: <http://www.adriasnews.com/2012/10/george-r-r-martin-interview.html?pref=tw>
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 3 (Books 9–12), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammer, D. (2002) 'The *Iliad* as Ethical Thinking: Politics, Pity and the Operation of Esteem' *Arethusa* 35.2: 203–35.
- Hampson, S.E. (1997), 'Determinants of Inconsistent Personality Descriptions: Trait and Target Effects', *Journal of Personality* 65 (2): 249–289.
- Handlen, Z. (2015), 'Someone finds some balloons on *The Walking Dead*', *avclub.com*, 22 November. Available online: <http://www.avclub.com/tvclub/someone-finds-some-balloons-walking-dead-228783>
- Harrigan, P. and N. Wardrip-Fruin (2009), *Third person: authoring and exploring vast narratives*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Hayward, J. (1997), *Consuming pleasures: Active Audiences and Serial Fictions from Dickens to Soap Opera*, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

- Heath, J. (2005), *The Talking Greeks: Speech, Animals, and the Other in Homer, Aeschylus, and Plato*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heiden, B. (1996), 'The three movements of the *Iliad*', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 37 (1): 5–22.
- Heiden, B. (1998), 'The Placement of Book Divisions in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118, 68–81.
- Heiden, B. (2008), 'Common People and Leaders in *Iliad* Book 2: The Invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138: 127–54.
- Hijmans, B.L. (1975), 'Alexandros and his grief', *Grazer Beiträge* 3: 177–90.
- Hill, D.E. (1971), '*Iliad* 22.191', *Hermes* 99.3: 372–4.
- Hills, M. (2008) 'The dispersible television text: theorizing moments of the new Doctor Who', *Science Fiction Film and Television*, 1.1: 25–44.
- Hinckley, L.V. (1986), 'Patroclus' Funeral Games and Homer's Character Portrayal', *The Classical Journal* 81.3: 209–21.
- Holland, P. (2000) *The Television Handbook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Holmberg, I. (1998), 'The Creation of the Ancient Greek Epic Cycle', *Oral Tradition* 13.2: 456–78.
- Holt, P. (1992), 'Ajax's Burial in Early Greek Epic', *American Journal of Philology* 113.3: 319–31.
- Janko, R. (1992), *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4 (Books 13–16), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaramillo, D. (2014) in Hilmes, M., C. Huber, D. Jaramillo, A. Martin, D. Milch, A. Nayman, M. Zoller Seitz, C. Sharrett, A. Taubin and B. Willimon, 'Rethinking Television', *Cineaste* 39.4: 26–38.
- Jenner, M. (2014) 'Is this TVIV? On Netflix, TVIII and binge-watching', *new media & society*: 1–17.
- Jensen, M.S. (1980), *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Jensen, M.S. (1999) 'Dividing Homer: when and how were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* divided into songs? Report', *Symbolae Osloenses* 74.1: 5–35.
- Jones, S.E. (2007), 'Dickens on "Lost": Text, Paratext, Fan-based Media', *The Wordsworth Circle* 38: 71–77.
- Kackman, M. (2010), 'Quality Television, Melodrama, and Cultural Complexity', *Flow*, 5 March. Available online: <http://flowtv.org/2010/03/flow-favorites-quality-television-melodrama-and-cultural-complexity-michael-kackman-university-of-texas-austin/>
- Kahane, A. (2005), *Diachronic Dialogues: Authority and Continuity in Homer and the Homeric Tradition*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kahane, A. (2016), 'Fan fiction, early Greece, and the historicity of canon', *Transformative Works and Cultures* 21. Available online: <http://journal.transformativeworks.org/index.php/twc/article/view/681/553>
- Kakridis, J.T. (1949), *Homeric Researches*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

- Keen, S. (2006), 'A Theory of Narrative Empathy', *Narrative* 14 (3): 207–36.
- Kelly, A. (2006), 'Neoanalysis and the "Nestorbedrängnis": A Test Case', *Hermes* 134: 1–25.
- Kelly, A. (2007), *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Iliad VIII*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (1962), *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (1978), 'The Formal Duels in Books 3 and 7 of the *Iliad*', in B.C. Fenik (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, 18–40, Leiden: Brill.
- Kirk, G.S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 1 (Books 1–4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (1990), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 2 (Books 5–8). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kozak, L. (2012), 'Character and Context in the Rebuke Exchange of *Iliad* 17.142–184', *Classical World* 106.1: 1–14.
- Kozak, L. (2014), 'Oaths between warriors in epic and tragedy', in A.H. Sommerstein and I.C. Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece*, *Beitrage zur Altertumskunde* 307, Berlin: de Gruyter, 60–7.
- Kretler, K. (2011), 'One Man Show: *Poiesis* and genesis in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', PhD diss., University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Krieter-Spiro, M. (2009), *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar* (Band III- 3. Gesang), (eds) A. Bierl and J. Latacz, de Gruyter.
- Krischer, T. (1971), *Formale Konventionen den homerischen Epik*, *Zetemata* 56: 30.
- Kyriakou, P. (2001), 'Warrior Vaunts in the *Iliad*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* n.f. 144: 250–77.
- Lane, N. (2005), '*Iliad* 13.754–55', *Illinois Classical Studies* 30: 1–5.
- Lang, M. (1989), 'Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30: 5–26.
- Lardinois, A.P.M.H. (2000), 'Characterization through *gnomai* in Homer's *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 53 (6): 641–661.
- Latacz, J. (1977), *Kampffaränese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*, *Zetemata* 66, Munich: Beck.
- Lateiner, D. (2002), 'Pouring Bloody Drops (*Iliad* 16.459): The Grief of Zeus', *Colby Quarterly* 38: 42–61.
- Lateiner, D. (1995), *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lattimore, R. (1951), *The Iliad*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Lavender-Smith, J. (2012), 'Loose- and Dead-End Afterlives of *Battlestar Galactica* and *Lost*', in M. Ames, ed., *Time in Television Narrative: Exploring Temporality in Twenty First-Century Programming*, Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Lavery, D. (2009), 'Lost and long-term television narrative' in P. Harrigan and N. Wardrip-Fruin (eds), *Third Person: Authoring and Exploring Vast Narratives*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press: 313–22.

- Leaf, W. (1900–1902), *Commentary on the Iliad*, London: Macmillan.
- Ledbetter, G. (1993), 'Achilles' Self-Address: *Iliad* 16.7–19', *American Journal of Philology* 114.4, 481–91.
- Lincoln, B. (1975), 'Homeric λύσσα: "Wolfish Rage"', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 80: 98–105.
- Lloyd, M. (1989), 'Paris/ Alexandros in Homer and Euripides', *Mnemosyne* 62: 76–8.
- Lord, A. B. (1936), 'Homer and Huso I: The Singer's Rests in Greek and South-slavic Heroic Song', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 67: 106–13.
- Louden, B. (1993), 'Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic', *Classical Antiquity* 12: 181–198.
- Louden, B. (2006), *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lozano, E. (1992), 'The Force of Myth on Popular Narratives: The Case of Melodramatic Serials', *Communication Theory* 2 (3): 207–220.
- Lynn-George, M. (1993), 'Aspects of the Epic Vocabulary of Vulnerability', *Colby Quarterly* 29: 197–221.
- Lynn-George, M. (1996), 'Structures of Care in the *Iliad*', *The Classical Quarterly* 46 (1): 1–26.
- MacCarron P. and R. Kenna (2012), 'Universal properties of mythological networks', *Europhysics Letters* 99.2. Available online: <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1209/0295-5075/99/28002/meta>
- Mackie, C. J. (2013), '*Iliad* 24 and the Judgement of Paris', *Classical Quarterly* 63.1: 1–16.
- Mackie, H. (1996), *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Macleod, C. (1982), *Homer: Iliad, Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madison, T.P. and L.V. Porter, (2015) 'The People We Meet: Discriminating Functions of Parasocial Interactions', *Imagination, Cognition and Personality: Consciousness in Theory, Research, and Clinical Practice* 35.1: 47–71.
- Margolin, U. (1986), 'The Doer and the Deed: Action as a Basis for Characterization in Narrative', *Poetics Today* 7 (2): 205–225.
- Margolin, U. (1989) 'Structuralist approaches to character in narrative', *Semiotica*. 75.1–2: 1–24
- Marks, J. (2010), 'Context as Hypertext: Divine Rescue Scenes in the *Iliad*', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (eds), *Trends in Classics*, F, 2.2 (2010) 302–22.
- Marks, J. (2012), 'ἄρχουὶς αὐτῶν νηῶν ἐπέω: A Programmatic Function of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds), *Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, 101–112, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Martin, R. P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Meltzer, G.S., (1990), 'The Role of Comic Perspectives in Shaping Homer's Tragic Vision', *Classical World* 83.4: 265–81.
- Miall, D. S. (1988), 'Affect and Narrative: a Model of Responses to Stories', *Poetics* 17: 259–72.

- Michlin, M. (2011) 'More, More, More: Contemporary American TV Series and the Attractions and Challenges of Serialization As Ongoing Narrative', *Mise au Point* 3. Available online: <http://map.revues.org/927octo1n2>
- Miller, J.H. (1985), *Fiction and Repetition: Seven English Novels*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mills, S. (2000), 'Achilles, Patroclus and parental care in some Homeric similes', *Greece and Rome* 47 (1): 3–18.
- Minchin, E. (1992), 'Scripts and Themes: Cognitive Research and Homeric Epic', *Classical Antiquity* 11 (2): 229–41.
- Minchin, E. (1995) 'The Poet Appeals to His Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance', *Classical Journal* 91.1: 25–33.
- Minchin, E. (1999), 'Serial repetition in Homer and the "Poetics of Talk": a case study from the *Odyssey*', *Oral Tradition* 14 (2): 336–53.
- Minchin, E. (1999), 'Describing and Narrating in Homer's *Iliad*', in *Signs of Orality*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, *Mnemosyne Supplement*, Leiden: Brill.
- Minchin, E. (2001), *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minchin, E. (2001), 'Similes in Homer: Image, Mind's Eye, and Memory', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, Leiden: Brill, 25–52.
- Minchin, E. (2006), 'Can One Ever Forget? Homer on the Persistence of Painful Memories', *Scholia* 15: 2–16.
- Minchin, E. (2008), 'Spatial Memory and the Composition of the *Iliad*', in E. A. Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, Leiden: Brill, 9–34.
- Minchin, E. (2008), 'Communication without Words: Body Language, 'Pictureability' and Memorability in the *Iliad*', *Ordia Prima* 7: 17–38.
- Minchin, E. (2011), "'Themes" and "Mental Moulds": Roger Schank, Malcolm Willcock and The Creation of Character in Homer', *Classical Quarterly* 61: 323–43.
- Minchin, E. (2012), 'Memory and Memories: Personal, Social, and Cultural Memory in the Poems of Homer', in *Homeric Contexts*, 83–99, 93.
- Mittell, J. (2006), 'Narrative complexity in contemporary American television', *The Velvet Light Trap* 58 (1): 29–40.
- Mittell, J. (2015), *Complex TV: The poetics of contemporary television storytelling*, New York: New York University Press.
- Morrison, J.V. (1992), *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Morrison, J.V. (1994), 'Thematic Inversion: The Greeks Under Siege', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 35.3: 209–26.
- Morrison, J.V. (1997), "'Kerostasia, The Dictates of Fate, and the Will of Zeus in the *Iliad*.'", *Arethusa* 30: 276–96.
- Mueller, M. (1970), 'Knowledge and Delusion in the *Iliad*', *Mosaic* 3.2, 96.

- Mueller, M. (2013) *The Iliad*, 2nd edn. London: A & C Black.
- Muellner, L. (1996), *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Murnaghan, S. (1997) 'Equal honor and future glory: the plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*', in Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler (eds), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 23–42.
- Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nagy, G. (1990) *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Nagy, G. (2015) 'A Failed Understudy for the Role of Chariot Fighter: the Case of Koiranos, the King Who Never Was', *Classical Inquiries*, 15 May. Available online: <http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/a-failed-understudy-for-the-role-of-chariot-fighter-the-case-of-koiranos-the-king-who-never-was/>
- Newman, M. (2006), 'From Beats to Arcs: Toward a Poetics of Television Narrative', *The Velvet Light Trap* 58: 16–28.
- Nimis, S. (2002) 'Oral and Written Forms of Closure in the Ancient Novel' in C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Notopoulos, J.A. (1949), 'Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 80, 1–23.
- Notopoulos, J.A. (1964), 'Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68: 1–77.
- Nünlist, R. (2012), 'Nestor and Speaking Silence in the *Iliad*', *Philologus* 156: 150–6.
- Örnebring, H. (2007), 'The Show Must Go On . . . And On: Narrative and Seriality in *Alias*', in S. Abbott and S. Brown (eds.), *Investigating Alias: Secrets and Spies*, 11–26, London: I.B. Taurus and Company.
- O'Sullivan, S. (2006), 'Old, New, Borrowed, Blue: Deadwood and Serial Fiction' in D. Lavery (ed.), *Reading Deadwood: A Western to Swear By*, London: I.B. Taurus and Company, 115–29.
- O'Sullivan, S. (2008), 'The Sopranos vs. *Lost*: Sean O'Sullivan's opening statement on *The Sopranos*', *Project Narrative Weblog*, 10 June. Available online: <http://projectnarrative.wordpress.com/2008/06/10/pn-second-debate-the-sopranos-v-lost-debating-the-highs-and-lows-of-serial-narrative/>
- O'Sullivan, S. (2009), 'Reconnoitering the Rim: Thoughts on *Deadwood* and *Third Seasons*' in P. Harrigan and N. Wardrip-Fruin (eds), *Third Person: Authoring and Exploring Vast Narratives*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 323–33.
- O'Sullivan, S. (2010), 'Broken on Purpose: Poetry, Serial Television, and the Season', *StoryWorlds: A Journal of Narrative Studies*, 2 (1): 59–77.
- Pantelia, M.C. (2002), 'Helen and the Last Song for Hector', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132.1–2: 21–7.

- Passakos, C.G. and B. de Raad (2009), 'Ancient personality: Trait attributions to characters in Homer's *Iliad*', *Ancient Narrative* 7: 75–96.
- Pearson, R. (2007), 'Anatomising Gilbert Grissom: The Structure and Function of the Televisual Character', in M. Allen (ed.), *Reading CSI: Crime TV Under the Microscope*, London: I.B. Taurus and Company, 39–56.
- Pedrick, V. (1983), 'The Paradigmatic Nature of Nestor's Speech in *Iliad* 11', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113: 55–68.
- Petersen, B. (2011), 'Den serielle fortælleform Fra *Iliaden* til den moderne tv-serie', *Kosmorama* 248: 7–36.
- Phelan, J. (1989), *Reading people, reading plots: Character, progression, and the interpretation of narrative*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Phillips, T. (2015), '*Iliad* 13.754: ΟΡΕΙ ΝΙΦΟΕΝΤΙ ΕΟΙΚΩΣ', *Classical Quarterly* 65.2: 439–43.
- Plotz, J. (2013), 'Serial Pleasures: The Influence of Television on the Victorian Novel', *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net* 63. April. Available online: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ravon/2013/v/n63/1025619ar.html?lang=en>
- Porter, D.H. (1972), 'Violent Juxtaposition in the Similes in the *Iliad*', *Classical Journal* 68.1: 11–21.
- Porter, D. (2010), 'The Simile at *Iliad* 16.7–11 Once Again: Multiple Meanings', *Classical World* 103.4, 447–54.
- Porter, M.J., D.L. Larson, A. Harthcock and K.B. Nellis (2002), 'Re (de)fining Narrative Events Examining Television Narrative Structure', *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 30 (1): 23–30.
- Pratt, L. (2002), 'The Parental Ethos in the *Iliad*', *Hesperia Supplements* 41: *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy*, Athens: 25–40.
- Pucci, P. (1993), 'Antiphonal Lament Between Achilles and Briseis', *Colby Quarterly* 29.3: 258–72.
- Purves, A. (2006), 'Falling into Time in Homer's *Iliad*', *Classical Antiquity* 25: 179–209.
- Purves, A. (2010), *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quaglia, L. (1960) 'La Figura di Ettore e l'etica dell'*Iliade*', *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 94, 1959–60, Torino: 1–81.
- Rabel, R. (1991), 'Agamemnon's *Iliad*', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 32.2: 103–17.
- Rapp, D. N. and R. J. Grigg. (2001) 'Readers' Trait-Based Models of Characters in Narrative Comprehension', *Journal of Memory and Language* 45: 737–50.
- Raymond, A.K. (2015) 'Saulbacks: An Exhaustive Compendium of All the "Breaking Bad" References in "Better Call Saul"', *Esquire*, 7 April. Available online: <http://www.esquire.com/entertainment/tv/a32576/better-call-saul-breaking-bad-references/>
- Redfield, J. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Reichel, M. (1990), 'Retardationstechniken in der Ilias', *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, 125–52, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 125–52.

- Reichel, M. (1994), *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Rengakos, A. (1999), 'Spannungsstrategien in den homerischen Epen', in N. Kazakis and A. Rengakos (eds), *Euphrosyne. Studies in ancient epic and its legacy in honor of Dimitris*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 308–338.
- Richardson, N.J. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6 (Books 21–24), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, S. (1990), *The Homeric Narrator*, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Roisman, H. (2006), 'Helen in the *Iliad*, *Causa Belli* and Victim of War', *American Journal of Philology* 127.1, 1–36, 28–32.
- Rowles, D. (2013), 'These 25 Amazing Callbacks from the Final Season of "Breaking Bad" Will Blow Out Your Mindhole', *Uproxx*, 10 September. Available Online: <http://uproxx.com/tv/25-amazing-callbacks-final-season-breaking-bad/>
- Russo, J. (1976), 'Is "Oral" or "Aural" Composition the Cause of Homer's Formulaic Style?' in B.A. Stolz and R.S. Shannon (eds), *Oral Poetry and the Formula*, 31–54. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rutherford, R.B. (1982), 'Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102: 145–160.
- Rydberg-Cox, J. (2011), 'Social Networks and the Language of Greek Tragedy', *Journal of the Chicago Colloquium on Digital Humanities and Computer Science* 1.3: 1–11.
- Sacks, R. (1987), *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning and Interpretation*, Leiden: Brill, 105–51.
- Sammons, B. (2010), *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saraiya, S. (2014) 'Previously, on *The Good Wife* . . . 10 episodes to catch you up for season 6', *A.V. Club*, 16 July. Available online: <http://www.avclub.com/article/previously-good-wife-10-episodes-catch-you-season--206651>
- Schadewaldt, W. 'Hektor in der *Ilias*', *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956) 5–25.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1965), *Von Homers Welt und Werk: Aufsätze und Auslegungen zur homerischen Frage*, 4th edn, Stuttgart: Koehler.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1966), *Iliasstudien*, 3rd edn, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1997), 'Hektor and Andromache' in *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*, Trans. G.M. Wright and P.V. Jones, 124–69, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schein, S. (1984), *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schein, S. (2016), 'The Horses of Achilles in Book 17 of the *Iliad*', in *Homeric Epic and its Reception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 11–26.
- Schofield, M. (1986) 'Euboulia in the *Iliad*', *Classical Quarterly* 36.1: 6–31.
- Scholes, R. and R. Kellogg (1966), *The Nature of Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scodel, R. (1997), 'Pseudo-Intimacy and Prior Knowledge of the Homeric Audience', *Arethusa* 30 (2): 201–19.

- Scodel, R. (1999), *Credible Impossibilities: Conventions and Strategies of Verisimilitude in Homer and Greek Tragedy*, *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 122, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Scodel, R. (2007) 'The Gods' Visit to the Ethiopians in *Iliad* 1', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103: 83–98.
- Scodel, R. (2008), 'Zielinski's Law Reconsidered', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 138: 107–125.
- Scodel, R. (2012), 'ἦ and Theory of Mind in the *Iliad*' in M. Meier-Brügger (ed.), *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 315–30.
- Scodel, R. (2014), 'Narrative Focus and Elusive Thought in Homer' in D. Cairns and R. Scodel (eds), *Defining Greek Narrative*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 55–74.
- Scodel, R. and C. Whitman (1981), "'Sequence and Simultaneity in *Iliad* N, E, and O', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 85: 1–15.
- Sconce, J. (2003), 'Dickens, Selznick, and Southpark', in J. Glavin (ed.), *Dickens on Screen*, 171–87, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, J.A. (1913), 'Paris and Hector in Tradition and in Homer', *Classical Philology* 8 (2): 160–71.
- Scott, J.A. (1945), 'Homer and Hector', *American Journal of Philology* 66 (2): 187–9.
- Scott, W.C. (1974), *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*, Leiden, Brill.
- Scully, S. (1990), *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Scully, S. (1990), 'Reading the Shield of Achilles: Terror, Anger, Delight', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101: 29–47.
- Seaford, R. (1994), *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seeskin, K.R. (1977), 'The Comedy of the Gods in the *Iliad*', *Philosophy and Literature* 1.3: 295–306.
- Segal, C. (1971a), 'Andromache's *Anagnōrisis*: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437–476', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75: 33–57.
- Segal, C. (1971), 'The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne Supplement* 17, Leiden: Brill.
- Segal, C. (1986), 'Tithonus and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*: A Comment', *Arethusa* 19.1: 37–47.
- Shannon, R.S. (1975), *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique*, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 36, Leiden: Brill.
- Sharples, R. W. (1983), "'But Why has My Spirit Spoken with Me Thus?'" Homeric Decision-Making', *Greece and Rome* 30 (1): 1–7.
- Shroder, K.C. (1988) 'The pleasure of *Dynasty*' in eds P. Drummond and R. Paterson, *Television and Its Audience*, London: British Film Institute.
- Sikes, E.E. (1940), 'The Humour of Homer', *Classical Review* 54.3: 121–7.
- Silk, M. (2004), *Homer: The Iliad*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. (2011), 'TV or Not TV? *The Sopranos* and Contemporary Episode

- Architecture in US Network and Premium Cable Drama', *Critical Studies in Television* 6 (1): 36–51.
- Smith, M. (1995), *Engaging characters: Fiction, emotion, and the cinema*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spatafora, G. (1997), 'Esigenza fisiologica e funzione terapeutica del lamento nei poemi omerici. (Studio sul significato di κλαίω, γοάω, στένω, οἰμώζω/κωκύω, ὀδύρομαι)', *L'Antiquité Classique* 66: 1–23.
- Stanley, K. (1993), *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sullivan, K.P. (2013) 'How "Star Trek" Was Simon Pegg's Ultimate Fan Dream', *MTV News*, 12 September 2013, <http://www.mtv.com/news/1713966/simon-pegg-star-trek-into-darkness/>
- Suter, A. (1993), 'Paris and Dionysos: Iambos in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 26: 1–18.
- Taplin, O. (1980), 'The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*', *Greece and Rome* 27: 1–21.
- Taplin, O. (1992), *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tarenzi, V. (2005), 'Patroclo θεράπων', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, n.s. 80.2: 25–38.
- Thompson, K. and D. Bordwell, (2011), 'Observations on film art', davidbordwell.net, 9 December. Available online: <http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/2011/05/25/graphic-content-ahead/>
- Thorndyke, P.W. (1977), 'Cognitive Structures in Comprehension and Narrative Discourse', *Cognitive Psychology* 9: 357–60.
- Tian, Q. and C.A. Hoffner, (2010) 'Parasocial interaction with liked, neutral, and disliked characters on a popular TV series', *Mass Communication and Society* 3.3: 250–69.
- Torrance, I. (2014), 'The Oaths of the Gods' in A.H. Sommerstein and I.C. Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 195–212.
- Traill, D. (1989), 'Gold Armor for Bronze and Homer's Use of Compensatory TIMH', *Classical Philology* 89.4: 301–5.
- Traill, D. (1990) 'Unfair to Hector?', *Classical Philology* 85.4: 299–303.
- Trendacosta, K. (2016), 'Simon Pegg Got Help from the *Star Trek* Fan Wiki while Writing *Star Trek Beyond*', *Gizmodo*, 19 April. Available online: <http://io9.gizmodo.com/simon-pegg-got-help-from-the-star-trek-fan-wiki-while-w-1771866467>
- Treu, M. (1955), *Von Homer zur Lyrik*. München: Beck.
- Troftgruben, T.M. (2010) *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts within its Literary Environment*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Trumbore, D. (2016) 'The Walking Dead: The Many Faces of Rick Grimes—A Video Tribute', *Collider.com*, Available online: <http://collider.com/the-walking-dead-rick-grimes-tribute-video/>
- Tsagalis, C. (2012), *From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the Iliad*, *Hellenic Studies* 53, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Turney, E. (2015) 'The *Iliad*: "A Song You Don't Want to End"', *Exeunt Magazine*, 21 September. Available online: <http://exeuntmagazine.com/features/the-iliad-a-song-you-dont-want-to-end/>
- van Brock, N. (1959), 'Substitution rituelle', *Revue hittite et asianique* 65: 117–46.
- VanDerWerff, T. (2014), "'In Media Res'" in 'What TV trope aggravates you the most?', *A. V. Club*, 14 May. Available online: <http://www.avclub.com/article/what-tv-trope-aggravates-you-most-202160>
- Van Nortwick, T. (2001), 'Like a Woman: Hector and the Boundaries of Masculinity', *Arethusa* 34.2: 221–35.
- Van Wees, H. (1994), 'The Homeric Way of War: The *Iliad* and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)', *Greece & Rome* 41.1: 1–18.
- Van Wees, H. (1997) 'Homeric Warfare', in I. Morris, and B. Powell (eds), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden: Brill, 668–93
- Vermeule, B. (2010), *Why Do We Care About Literary Characters?*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Walcot, P. (1979), 'Cattle Raiding, Heroic Tradition, and Ritual: The Greek Evidence', *History of Religions* 78.4: 326–51.
- Watkins, C. (1998) 'Homer and Hittite Revisited', in P. Knox and E. Foss, eds., *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 201–11.
- West, M. L. (1988), 'The Rise of the Greek Epic', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 151–72.
- Whitman, C. (1958) *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilkins, A. (2014) 'Sons of Anarchy series finale begins tonight, might end sometime this week', *A. V. Club*, 9 December. Available online: <http://www.avclub.com/article/sons-anarchy-series-finale-begins-tonight-might-en-212767>
- Willcock, M. (2001), 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', in D. Cairns, *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 435–55.
- Williams, L. (2014), *On the Wire*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Worman, N. (2002), *The Cast of Character: Style in Ancient Literature*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wyatt, W. (1988), 'Homer in Performance: *Iliad* 1.348–427', *Classical Journal* 83.4: 289–97.
- Yamagata, N. (1989), 'The Apostrophe in Homer as Part of the Oral Technique', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36.1: 91–103.
- Yamagata, N. (2005), 'Clothing and Identity in Homer: The Case of Penelope's Web', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 58.4: 539–46.
- Yamagata, N. (2010), 'Epithets with Echoes: a Study on Formula-Narrative Interaction', in *Homeric Contexts*, 445–68.
- Yoshida, E. (2015), 'The Game of Game of Thrones: Season 5, Episode 8, Hardhome', *The Verge*, 3 June. Available online: <http://www.theverge.com/2015/6/3/8718347/game-of-thrones-recap-season-5-episode-8-hardhome>

- Young, C. (2015), 'Don't Root for the *Game of Thrones* White Walkers Just Yet', *Time*, 17 June <http://time.com/3924156/game-of-thrones-white-walkers/>
- Zanker, G. (1996), *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Zielinski, T. (1999), 'The treatment of Simultaneous Events in Ancient Epic', trans. C. Krojzl and S.R. van der Mije, in de Jong, I.J.F. (ed.), *Homer: Critical Assessments*, Vol. 4, London and New York: Routledge Press, 317–7.

Index

- Ablers 55
- Achaian Wall 78, 90, 97, 106, 109, 111–16,
119, 121, 124, 128, 129, 134, 156, 163,
192, 196, 259 n.22, 259 n.26, 264 n.94,
264 n.109, 264 n.110, 264 n.112,
265 n.120, 265 n.122, 268 n.166
- Achilles 7, 8, 12, 13, 24, 30, 85, 97, 120, 130,
175, 188, 192
- absence 14, 30, 44, 57, 69, 76, 85, 88,
90–1, 97, 98, 120, 131, 144, 150, 161,
169, 193
- and Aineias 188–90, 195
- armour 106, 151, 160, 164–7, 176, 178–9,
186, 199
- change in 17, 193–4
- conflict with Agamemnon 24–6, 28–9,
30, 44, 85, 90–1, 94, 98, 105, 116,
129, 149, 151, 180, 182–4, 198, 210,
213, 223
- death 15, 28–9, 31, 32, 148, 166–7, 177,
190, 197
- and Hektor 13, 22, 25, 57, 66, 73–5, 88,
90, 91, 105, 107, 111, 131–2, 135, 138,
142, 145, 147, 157, 161–2, 178, 187–8,
190–1, 198, 199–211
- horses 30, 95–6, 150, 162–3, 166, 171–3,
185–7, 198
- and Patroklos 17, 91–2, 103, 105–6, 139,
145, 148–51, 159, 161, 164–8, 170, 173,
175, 177, 181, 185, 191, 192, 207, 211,
215–16, 224
- and Priam 220–5
- return 94, 100, 105–6, 114, 125–7, 131,
139, 147, 149, 176
- and Thetis 24–7, 136, 149, 177, 217–19,
225
- and Xanthos 194–7
- addiction 1, 4, 21, 234
- Adrestos 32, 55, 163
- Agamemnon 12, 18, 36, 38, 43, 53, 55, 78,
81, 90, 97–100, 130–2, 138, 211, 215,
225–6, 249 n.149, 252 n.31, 257 n.82,
258 n.14, 259 n.30, 262 n.59, 263 n.86,
264 n.108, 266 n.140, 274 n.84
- conflict with Achilles 25–6, 44, 90, 105,
116, 149, 151, 180, 182–4, 198, 210,
213, 223
- and Hektor 28, 74, 93, 167, 207
- and Menelaos 40, 42, 49, 55, 66, 73,
93, 94
- wounded 99, 105, 129, 130–2, 148, 183
- Agenor 44, 98, 108, 122, 132, 138, 197–8,
200
- Aiantes 43, 49, 66, 81, 85, 111–12, 115–16,
118–19, 123, 125, 128, 131, 157, 172,
175–6, 178, 259 n.30, 265 n.120
- Aias (Telamonian) 36, 43, 44, 50, 54, 91, 97,
103, 131–3, 139–44, 153–4, 164–5,
167–8, 205, 214, 231, 258 n.14,
277 n.142
- and Hektor 74–8, 103–4, 118–20, 123,
127–8, 131–2, 137–9, 144, 150, 153–4,
164–5, 203, 226, 259 n.18, 265 n.120
- holding the line 106, 149, 169, 232
- and Menelaos 103, 164, 168, 172, 174–6
- with Oilean Aias *see* Aiantes
- and Teukros 86, 112–13, 119, 123, 139,
265 n.120
- Aineias 32, 46–54, 56, 77, 98, 109, 121–2,
132, 138, 169, 193, 263 n.81, 265 n.125,
267 n.150
- and Achilles 188–90, 195
- and Apollo 47, 169–76, 191, 193
- and Diomedes 82, 87, 212
- and Hektor 156–7, 171, 192
- and Poseidon 190, 197
- backstory 26, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 46, 47,
57, 60, 61, 66, 84, 92, 98, 105, 117, 121,
158, 181, 184, 188, 189, 190, 193, 199,
202, 208, 209, 211, 215, 217, 224
- battle injuries 42, 103, 105–6, 109, 128–30,
148
- Hektor's 132, 134–7, 144

- battle sequences 9, 53–4, 56–7, 61, 77–8, 81, 83, 89, 90, 93, 94, 97, 101, 104, 109, 110, 116, 122, 124, 127–8, 129–130, 131, 132, 133, 137–8, 141, 143–4, 151, 152, 163, 167, 168, 172, 178, 180, 190, 214, 240 n.35, 254 n.48, 262 n.71, 267 n.152, 279 n.13
 ‘chain reaction’ 133, 254 n.48, 267 n.152
 battle-fury (*menos/mévos*) 47, 50, 57, 86, 115, 116, 123, 142, 191
 Hektor’s 59–60, 65–6, 87–8, 108, 123, 136–7, 227
Battlestar Galactica (Syfy, 2003–9) 8, 258 n.2, 263 n.93
 beat juxtaposition 49, 52, 99, 118, 163, 210
 beat sequences 8, 9, 20
 examples 23, 24, 26, 31, 52, 54, 58, 69, 75–6, 78, 80–2, 89, 90, 94, 99, 114, 120, 128, 130, 134, 136, 140, 142, 148, 165, 184, 196, 212, 225, 255
 beat transitions 9, 21
 contrafactuals 51, 56, 73, 82, 85, 100, 112, 125, 140, 159, 163, 169, 178, 194, 197, 226, 254 n.58, 258 n.12, 260 n.32, 260 n.42, 262 n.76, 263 n.77, 264 n.110, 266 n.133, 271 n.33, 271 n.36, 273 n.67
 other examples 30, 124, 196
 beats 4, 6
 bird-signs 94, 110–11, 114, 117, 125, 127, 134, 180, 221, 224
 book divisions 10, 40, 183, 186, 192, 196, 245 n.86–9, 246 n.94, 249 n.154, 259 n.27
 see also performance breaks
Breaking Bad (AMC, 2008–13) 3, 18, 19, 130–1, 247 n.126
 Walter White 18–19, 20, 131, 247 n.126
 Briseis 24, 26, 30, 184–5, 225–6, 228, 274 n.85–6, 277 n.132
Buffy the Vampire Slayer (WB, 1997–2001) 7, 15, 271 n.36
 C.K., Louis 10, 245 n.84
 callbacks 69–70, 72–3, 77, 87, 100, 101, 106, 112, 130, 131, 138, 143, 159, 166, 184, 185, 196, 200, 201, 203, 206, 210, 212, 220, 223, 226, 266 n.143–5, 277 n.134
 catalogues 85, 98, 108, 116, 124, 130, 132, 138, 150, 167, 168, 188, 221, 251 n.14–15, 251 n.17, 251 n.25, 254 n.57, 261 n.45, 266 n.132, 267 n.153, 272 n.52
 Book 2, 29–32, 34, 36, 46, 55, 72, 76, 118, 122, 169, 212
 character absence 21, 27, 42, 47–9, 53, 56, 63, 67, 69, 72, 74, 80, 85, 91–2, 97, 98, 99, 109, 120, 129, 131, 133, 150, 154, 161, 169, 193, 196, 251 n.17, 265 n.125
 character alignment 5–8, 12, 19
 access 5–8
 access to Hektor 35, 35, 52, 58, 67, 118, 137, 164, 205
 alignment with Hektor 53, 107, 115, 124, 127, 131, 138, 139, 171, 200
 attachment 5–6
 attachment to Hektor 35, 57, 59, 62, 63, 64, 82, 166
 character allegiance 5–18, 13, 15, 17–23
 allegiance to Hektor 23, 49, 51, 81, 103, 154, 166, 201
 character-centric episode/beat-sequence 12, 58
 character external markers 5, 58, 142, 241 n.44
 character hierarchy 12, 255 n.64
 character overhaul 17–18, 21, 247 n.125
 Diomedes 45–6, 83, 87, 212
 Hektor 49–50, 86–9, 114–16, 142–3, 167–8
 Patroklos 214, 271 n.38
 see also aristeia
 character recognition 5–7, 12, 18–21
 Hektor 31, 33, 35, 44, 46, 47, 48, 52, 58, 60, 63, 72, 83, 87, 96, 118, 143, 149, 151, 199, 204, 228
 charioteers 99, 121, 150, 174, 186
 Hektor’s 86, 97, 103, 108, 160, 172, 271 n.37, 273 n.60
 see also red-shirts
 Charops 102
 Chersidamas 102
 Chromios 43, 51, 167, 172
 Chromis 32
 Chryseis 24, 26, 27, 250 n.10
 Chryses 24

- cliffhangers 11, 29, 245 n.91, 256 n.72,
265 n.116
see also *narrative aperture*
- comic books 3, 4, 233, 243 n.66
- Coronation Street* (ITV, 1960-) 3
- curses 46, 130, 190, 221
- Damasos 110
- dangling storylines 11, 13, 22, 32, 78, 106,
114, 117, 119, 121, 132, 162, 165, 184,
215, 242 n.60
- Daredevil* (Netflix 2015-) 7, 153, 242 n.61,
270 n.20-1
- Deïkoön 49
- Deïopites 102
- Deïphobos 109, 117, 119, 121-2, 126-8,
135, 203-4
- Deïpyros 90, 116, 121-3, 263 n.81,
267 n.150
- Demokoön 44
- Dexter* (Showtime, 2006-13) 5
- diegetic re-telling 8, 11, 25, 40, 46, 70, 87,
126, 128, 178, 203, 220, 225
- Diokles 49
- Diomedes 12, 18, 28, 43, 46, 51, 55, 57, 59,
66, 74, 79, 85, 90, 94, 97, 101, 130, 149,
213, 214
aristeia 45-9, 83, 87, 254 n.49
and Athena 45, 46, 53, 57, 196, 212,
254 n.61
and Glaukos 58, 255 n.71-2
and Hektor 50, 74, 82-6, 89, 102, 161,
259 n.30, 260 n.34-6, 260 n.40,
263 n.80
and Nestor 82-4, 89
and Odysseus 49, 94-6, 101, 129-32, 183
overhaul 45-6, 50
wounded 103, 129, 148, 183
- Dollhouse* (FOX, 2009-10) 17
- Dolon 95-6
- Dream 28, 30
- Dresos 55
- Duchovny, David 47
- Easter egg 111, 214
- Echepolos 44
- Eëtion 65, 66, 203
- Eïoneus 72
- Elatos 55
- Elementary* (CBS, 2012-) 255 n.70
- Elephenor 44
- embassy 90-2
- enargeia* (vividness) 29, 30, 41, 65, 67, 86,
98, 103, 104, 114, 118, 124, 143, 152,
192, 265 n.123
- endings 3, 69, 147-8, 187, 190, 225,
226, 234
- Eniopeus 82, 86
- Ennomos 32, 102, 167
- Enyo 50
- episode 1-12, 22, 178, 192
see also *performance breaks*
- epithets 7, 31, 243 n.65
Hektor's 35, 58, 63, 125, 243 n.67,
251 n.20
- Epstein, Alex 6, 242 n.57
- ER* (NBC, 1994-2009) 3
- Euryalos 55, 213-14
- Eurypylos 45, 55, 85, 103-6, 148, 259
- Fear 44
- The Flash* (CW, 2014-) 267 n.151
- flash-sideways 204, 271 n.36
- formulae 102, 107, 235 n.2, 250 n.13,
251 n.20, 272 n.56, 278 n.146,
278 n.151
- Game of Thrones* (HBO, 2011-) 3, 8, 9, 11,
14, 16-17, 22, 24, 25, 43, 44, 54, 67,
154, 156, 164, 169, 253 n.47, 255 n.66,
272 n.53
- Stannis Baratheon 43
- 'Battle of Blackwater' 43
- Brienne of Tarth 8, 16
- Sandor Clegane (the Hound) 164
- Syrio Forel 156
- 'Hardhome' 9, 54, 110, 154, 244 n.79,
270 n.25
- Jory 156
- Karsi 9, 154
- Cersei Lannister 16-17, 25, 43
- Jaime Lannister 16-17, 25
- Joffrey Lannister 43
- Tyrion Lannister 43
- Tywin Lannister 25
- Missandei 67
- 'The Night King' 9
- 'Pilot' 23, 25

- Davos Seaworth 44
 Jon Snow 8, 9, 54, 154, 232
 Arya Stark 67
 Bran Stark 14, 16, 24
 Ned Stark 24, 156
 Eddison Tollett 9, 54
 the Wall 9, 39, 40, 54, 66
 gaps in knowledge 15, 28, 56, 91, 100, 104,
 105, 241 n.50, 271 n.41
see also melodramatic alignment
 structure
 gestures 5, 65, 67, 177, 184, 199, 200, 207,
 224, 225, 241 n.44, 273 n.65, 274 n.85,
 278 n.157, 279 n.162
 Gilligan, Vince 18, 247 n.126
 Glaukos 58, 72, 109, 112, 156, 157,
 255 n.71–2, 260 n.40, 264 n.112,
 274 n.89
 and Hektor 165–6, 223, 251 n.25
 and Sarpedon 32, 109, 113, 132, 155, 158
 gods 52–3, 89, 98, 114–20, 125, 130, 135–7,
 144, 159, 169, 178, 181, 187–90, 196–7,
 202, 206, 212, 216–19, 221–2, 224,
 232–3
 hating Troy 41, 89, 181, 216
The Good Wife (CBS, 2009–16) 11, 55,
 246 n.92, 246 n.94, 255 n.67
 Gorgythion 86
- Haimon 43
 Halios 51
Hannibal (NBC, 2013–15) 1, 11, 147–8,
 233–4, 235 n.1, 280 n.5
 Harpalion 124
 Hate 44, 97–8, 106, 113
 Hekabe 60–1, 69, 201, 223, 224, 277 n.132
 and Achilles 219–21, 247 n.122,
 278 n.154
 and Hektor 59–60, 62, 63, 65, 67, 200,
 206, 207–8, 209, 210, 226, 228
 and Priam 200, 201, 210, 220–1
 Hekamede 105, 129
 Hektor 1, 8, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20–2, 31, 32, 44
 absence 27, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 80,
 99, 154
 and Achilles 13, 22, 25, 57, 66, 73–5, 88,
 90, 91, 105, 107, 111, 131–2, 135, 138,
 142, 145, 147, 157, 161–2, 178, 187–8,
 190–1, 198, 199–211
 and Aias 74–8, 103–4, 118–20, 123,
 127–8, 131–2, 137–9, 144, 150, 153–4,
 164–5, 203, 226, 259 n.18, 265 n.120
 allegiance to 49, 51–2, 59, 67–9, 77, 80,
 81, 132, 154, 166
 as commander of the Trojans 31, 32, 44,
 46, 98, 108, 127, 149, 157, 168, 204
 death 1, 72, 78, 87, 107, 131, 135, 137,
 140, 144–5, 162, 178, 190, 198, 199,
 200, 203, 206, 207, 210, 216, 219, 221,
 222, 228, 231, 232, 258 n.7, 272 n.56,
 as the defender of Troy 21, 58, 64, 99,
 204, 223, 257 n.91
 funeral 2, 68, 73, 215–16, 219, 225, 228–9,
 279 n.170
 as a god 57, 207, 208, 221, 276 n.125
 and Hekabe 59–60, 62, 63, 65, 67, 200,
 206, 207–8, 209, 210, 226, 228
 and Helen 61–3, 66, 68, 70, 228
 man-slaughtering 26, 28, 50, 68, 161, 227
 missions 56, 58, 61–8, 84, 92, 94, 95, 126,
 127, 168
 and Paris 21, 33–5, 37, 40, 60, 61–3, 64,
 69, 70–3, 75, 95, 125, 126–8, 137, 141,
 228, 249 n.150, 252 n.28, 252 n.31,
 268 n.171
 physical appearance 21, 31, 51, 60, 61, 67,
 167, 205, 207, 228
 shiny-helmeted 31, 35, 51, 58, 63, 66, 175,
 257
 and Sarpedon 47–8, 51–2, 60, 65, 66, 79,
 154–5, 156–7, 223
 son of Priam 7, 31, 52, 56, 72, 87, 116,
 131, 190, 211
 and the Trojan women 59, 73, 166–7,
 178, 199, 210, 226
 Helen 15, 40, 69, 81, 257 n.82, 257 n.84,
 279 n.168, 279 n.170–1
 abduction 55, 81–2, 123
 and Hektor 61–3, 66, 68, 70, 228
 and Paris 60–1, 61–3, 81
 and Priam 36–7
 return 36, 40, 79–80, 82, 98, 201
 Helenos 8, 56–60, 63, 72–4, 99, 108–9,
 122–3, 126–8, 221
 Hephaistos 27, 164, 179, 181–3, 186, 187–8,
 195–6, 203
 Hera 134, 135, 178–9, 186, 187, 188,
 275 n.98, 276 n.119

- and Athena 52–3, 88, 98, 189–90, 195–6, 216
 and Hektor 85, 87, 93, 207, 216–17
 and Zeus 27, 40–1, 84–5, 88–9, 97, 117, 127, 130–1, 136, 155, 158, 181, 184, 202, 266 n.141, 267 n.146
- Hippodamas 101
 Hippolochos 98
 Hippomachos 110
 Hippotion 133
Homicide: Life on the Street (NBC, 1993–9) 15
Horace and Pete (louisck.net, 2016) 10
 Hyperiochos 101
 Hypsenor 45, 121
 Hyrtios 133
- Ialmenos 90
 Iamenos 110
 Idaios 79, 221–2, 226
 Idomeneus 36, 43, 45, 66, 81, 103, 109, 118–22, 128, 131, 137, 138, 144, 152, 174, 212–13, 267 n.150
 and Meriones 45, 85, 119–20, 122–4, 153, 168, 174, 215, 259 n.30, 276 n.119
in media res 11, 23, 43, 148, 246 n.94, 269 n.3
 internal audience 36, 48, 64, 161
 Iris 30, 32, 36, 99, 135–6, 179, 181, 217–19, 225
 and Hektor 99–100, 104, 111, 178
 in disguise 30, 36, 40, 57
 Isos 98
iZombie (CW, 2015–) 17
- Kalchas 7, 28, 115
 Kalesios 55
 Kaletor 139–40
 Cassandra 199, 226, 277 n.132, 279 n.165
 Kebriones 86, 103, 108, 127, 160, 271 n.37–8
 Koiranos 51, 174, 273 n.60
 Krethon 49
- lamentation 64, 68, 70, 73, 171, 177, 178, 181, 182, 185, 207, 208, 210, 217, 218, 219, 227, 231, 274 n.85, 277 n.132, 278 n.154
 Laodike 36, 59, 60
 Laogonos 157, 192
- Laomedon 196
 Lapithai 109–10
 left flank 103, 120, 124, 126, 127, 128, 263 n.84
 Leitos 55, 116, 140
 Leonteus 109–10, 214
 Leukos 44
 lists 51, 52, 100, 102, 123, 124, 126, 132, 133, 134, 138, 148
Lost (ABC, 2004–10) 6, 12, 69–70, 254 n.47, 258 n.2
 Lykaon 17, 188, 193–5, 199, 203, 214, 252 n.35, 275 n.104
 Lykia 32, 48, 158–9, 165
 Lykians 50–1, 112–13, 155–7
 Lykomedes 90, 113, 169
 Lykophron 139
 Lyrnessos 30, 188–9
- Machaon 42, 103–6, 108, 129
 Martin, George R. R. 22
 Marvel movies 226
 Medon 138, 167
 Meges 45, 125, 138, 141, 152
 Melanthios 55
- melodramatic alignment structure
 discussion 6, 8, 12–14, 22
 examples of 28, 37, 54, 56, 61, 62, 64, 82, 91, 95, 100, 103, 105, 109, 114, 119, 122, 124, 126, 129, 135, 144, 147, 156, 158, 162, 170, 174, 183, 184, 198, 203, 206, 212, 222, 232
see also character alignment, gaps in knowledge
- memory
 audience memory 4, 55, 60, 70, 91, 111, 127, 129, 139, 157, 188, 190, 199, 203, 206, 261 n.48
 character memory 21, 91, 96, 189, 213, 215, 228, 257 n.96
 performer memory 2, 236 n.6
- Menelaos 28, 45–6, 53, 103, 125, 133, 167, 172–3, 177, 212–13, 232, 253 n.42, 253 n.44
 and Agamemnon 40–2, 49, 55, 66, 73, 92–4, 98
 and Aias 103, 164, 168, 172, 174–6
 apostrophe to 41, 73, 123, 176, 275 n.91
 and Hektor 49, 73, 75, 141, 164

- and Meges 152–3
 and Paris 33–5, 37–9, 72, 77, 98, 124, 126,
 257 n.82
 and Patroklos 163, 165, 173–6, 185, 189,
 191, 210
 Menesthes 50
 Menestheus 43, 112–13, 118, 125
 Menesthios 72, 150
 Menon 110
menos/μένοχος see battle-fury
 Meriones 90, 116–17, 121, 128, 133, 138,
 152, 175–6, 212–13, 215, 259 n.30
 and Idomeneus 45, 85, 119–20, 122–4,
 153, 168, 174, 215, 259 n.30, 276 n.119
 Merops 101
 meta-poetics 26, 47–8, 63, 79, 93, 169, 179,
 186, 189
 Miall, David 19, 248 n.131
 Mikkelsen, Mads 1, 235 n.1
 minor characters 9, 32, 81, 160, 250 n.6,
 251 n.23, 253 n.47, 261 n.44
 death (see also red-shirts) 246 n.97
 mirror story 26–7, 250 n.11
 missions 8, 13, 26–8, 36, 41, 56, 59–60, 89,
 90, 94, 96–7, 104–6, 112–13, 116, 117,
 131, 136, 139, 148, 157, 164, 165, 172,
 174, 175–7, 178, 179, 183, 250 n.9
 and Hektor 56, 58, 61–8, 84, 89, 92, 95,
 100, 108–9, 111, 121–2, 126–7, 135,
 155–8, 166, 167–9, 190, 217
 Mittell, Jason 3, 5, 8, 12, 16, 17, 18–19, 25,
 45, 69, 78, 237 n.19–20, 238 n.25,
 239 n.28, 240 n.40, 241 n.43, 242 n.52,
 243 n.69, 246 n.95, 247 n.118,
 247 n.120, 247 n.123, 247 n.129,
 250 n.1, 250 n.3, 254 n.50, 258 n.3,
 259 n.21, 263 n.93, 269 n.2, 270 n.15
 Moebio labs 14, 246 n.108, 255 n.64
 Molion 101
 monologue 200
 inner 5, 241 n.42
 montage 55
 Moullos 192
Mr. Robot (USA, 2015–) 5
 Mt. Ida 80, 99, 101, 130, 136, 137, 216
 Mt. Olympos 27, 40, 53–4, 80, 88, 135, 149,
 178, 216–17, 222, 223
 multi-plot structure see storylines
 Muses 29, 30, 133, 134, 150, 251 n.17
 Mydon 49, 194
 Myrmidons 91, 150, 151, 157, 210, 269 n.11,
 278 n.161
 narrative aperture 11, 45, 192, 245 n.89
 see also cliffhangers and dangling
 storylines
 narrative expansion/escalation 54, 153, 158,
 162, 270 n.19
 narrative resolution 11–13, 21, 22, 24, 27,
 28, 29, 40, 62, 68, 78, 80, 89, 92, 97, 114,
 121, 127, 130, 132, 136, 162, 165, 172,
 183, 184, 196, 197, 210, 215, 218, 224,
 226, 232, 237 n.24
 Nastes 32
 Nestor 28, 43, 56, 74–5, 78, 85, 90, 93–4, 97,
 128–9, 138–9, 143, 148–9, 151, 170,
 181, 212–13, 253 n.45, 253 n.47,
 256 n.77, 262 n.59, 263 n.89–90,
 266 n.139, 277 n.139
 and Diomedes 80–4, 89, 101, 259 n.31
 and Patroklos 103–7
 networks 22, 54, 56, 70, 122, 255 n.64
 Newman, Michael Z. 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16,
 239 n.30, 242 n.55, 242 n.59, 243 n.66,
 245 n.90, 246 n.106–7, 247 n.112,
 247 n.119
 Niobe 225, 228, 278 n.160, 279 n.169
 Nireus 30
 Noemon 51
Northern Exposure (CBS, 1990–5) 7
NYPD Blue (ABC, 1993–2005) 3, 12
 oaths 26, 35–40, 95–6, 130, 134, 184, 190,
 195, 213, 253 n.45, 258 n.9, 262 n.61,
 268 n.158, 275 n.98, 277 n.141
 broken 41–6, 55, 62, 66, 72–3,
 79–81
 foresworn 95–6
 Odios 45
 Odysseus 24, 28, 36, 37, 39, 43, 44, 49, 51,
 53, 55, 74, 81, 97, 106, 214, 242 n.56,
 255 n.69, 256 n.77, 257 n.82, 258 n.14,
 259 n.30, 277 n.142
 and Achilles 90–1, 184, 276 n.125
 in contrast to Hektor 52
 and Diomedes 82, 94–6, 100–2, 131–2
 wounded 103, 105, 123, 129, 148, 183
 Ophelestes 194

- Opheltios 55
 oral poetry 1, 235 n.2–3, 236 n.16–17,
 243 n.66, 245 n.85
 Orestes 110
 Ormenos 110
 Orsilochos 49
 Othryoneus 120
- Pandaros 41–2, 45–8, 54, 55, 64, 73, 79, 95,
 253 n.44
 Panthoös 179
 parasocial relationships 233–5, 249 n.155
 Paris 15, 32, 40–2, 45, 47, 70, 206, 216,
 252 n.26, 256 n.78, 257 n.82, 257 n.83,
 272 n.50
 in battle 102–3, 104, 108, 122, 123, 124,
 126–8, 138
 and Hektor 21, 33–5, 37, 40, 60, 61–3, 64,
 69, 70–3, 75, 95, 125, 126–8, 137, 141,
 228, 249 n.150, 252 n.28, 252 n.31,
 268 n.171
 and Helen 55, 56, 61, 79, 81, 82, 98
 judgment of 61, 216, 253 n.41,
 278 n.147
 and Menelaos 33–9, 72, 77, 98, 124, 126,
 257 n.82
 son of Priam 199, 221
The Path (Hulu, 2016–) 43
pathos 37, 82, 124, 132, 159, 160, 168, 170,
 185, 199, 224, 268 n.172, 268 n.175,
 270 n.17, 271 n.33
 Patroklos 1, 12, 18, 19, 104, 105, 108, 135,
 264 n.99, 271 n.34, 273 n.63, 275 n.91
 and Achilles 105, 106, 139, 147, 148, 159,
 170, 176–8, 193–4, 197–8, 207, 211,
 215–16, 222, 224, 263 n.89
 aristeia 12, 18, 152, 182, 211, 260 n.37,
 271 n.38
 arming scene 150, 186, 269 n.8–9
 corpse 162–70, 172–5, 176, 178–81, 183,
 189, 210, 271 n.40, 273 n.73, 274 n.82
 death 17, 88–9, 91–2, 100, 114, 131, 147,
 148, 149, 162, 184, 186, 187–8,
 271 n.39, 271 n.40
 and Eurypylos 97, 138–9, 148
 funeral 92, 211–15, 216, 217
 and Hektor 60, 61–3, 64, 70–1, 75, 132,
 148, 151, 152, 154, 158, 159–62, 202,
 205, 206, 228, 250 n.13
 memory of 19, 173, 175, 184–5, 211, 215
 and Sarpedon 155–7
 patronyms 7, 56, 253 n.47
 Pearson, Roberta 16, 247 n.116, 249 n.152
 Pedasos 55
Peep Show (Channel 4, 2003–15) 5
 Peiros 45
 Peisandros 98, 112, 150
 Pelagon 43
 performance 2, 11, 62, 76
 performance breaks 22, 53, 69, 97, 154–5,
 183, 196, 203, 206, 212, 236 n.18,
 245 n.88, 250 n.10, 253 n.40, 254 n.62,
 263 n.88, 267 n.157, 271 n.40,
 273 n.61, 274 n.88
 possible breaks (1.350) 26, (1|2) 27,
 (2.468) 29, (2.785) 30, (3|4) 40, (5.702)
 52, (5.165) 46, (6.502) 68, 70, (7|8) 80,
 83, (8.488) 89, (8|9) 90, (9.88) 90,
 (9|10) 92, 97, (10|11) 97, (11.594) 104,
 107, (11|12) 106, (12|13) 114, (13|14)
 128, 131, (14|15) 134, (14.507) 134,
 (15|16) 148, 153, (16|17) 162, (17.383)
 170, (17.542) 170, 172–4, (17|18) 170,
 176, (18.147) 178, 182, (18|19) 183,
 186, (19|20) 187, (21.514 or 21.525)
 196–7, 198, 200, (21|22) 198, (22|23)
 210, (23|24) 215
 performance time 2–3, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30,
 36, 42, 44, 46, 52, 53, 54, 66, 69, 72, 74,
 75, 82, 90, 93, 97, 107, 110, 116, 118,
 121, 123, 126, 129, 131, 133, 134, 135,
 143, 144, 148, 149, 153, 154, 158, 163,
 173, 178, 182, 183–4, 187, 189, 190,
 196, 206, 208, 211, 212, 213, 225, 226,
 228, 236 n.7–11, 236 n.18, 237 n.23,
 238 n.26, 242 n.62, 253 n.47, 259 n.25,
 263 n.88, 265 n.122, 269 n.4, 278 n.159
 Periphetes 133, 142–3
 Perithoös 110
 Phaistos 45
 Phylakos 55
 Pidytes 55
 piecemeal integration 19–20
 poetics 1, 2, 4, 10, 22, 232, 262 n.57
 Polites 30–1, 40, 57, 122, 138, 221
 Polybos 98
 Polydoros 191, 199, 252 n.35
 Polypoites 55, 109–10, 214

- Poseidon 80, 84, 106, 107, 131, 133, 187, 189, 190, 195, 197, 216, 266 n.140, 267 n.146
 and Apollo 80, 107, 188, 196
 and Hektor 115, 116, 123, 127, 131–2, 134, 144
 and Zeus 113–20, 130, 134–6, 265 n.118
 Poulydamas 98, 121, 127, 132, 133, 134, 138, 140, 141, 144, 152, 174, 264 n.107
 and Hektor 108–11, 114, 117, 125–6, 128, 156, 179–80, 200, 264 n.106, 273 n.70
 Priam 36–9, 41, 79, 121, 189–90, 197–9, 276 n.114
 and Achilles 223–6, 278 n.157
 as a father 39, 44, 86, 98, 103, 109, 116, 118, 160, 188, 191, 193, 214, 219, 221, 252 n.35
 and Hekabe 200, 201, 210, 220–1
 and Hektor 67, 199, 206, 207–8, 215–16, 224, 228–9
 as Hektor's father 7, 29, 31, 38, 52, 56, 72, 84, 87, 131, 211, 216–18, 222
 and Hermes 221–3, 225
 palace of 29, 59, 61, 79, 256 n.75
 as ruler of Troy 30, 32, 35, 59, 61, 80, 99, 107, 202, 227
 prolepsis 8, 27, 88, 244 n.73
 Protesilaos 30, 124, 143, 151, 251 n.16, 251 n.22, 268 n.177
 Prytanis 51
 Pylaimenes 49, 124
 Pylon 110
 radio serials 4
 rebuke 33–4, 37, 40, 49, 52, 55, 126–8, 156, 163, 173, 194–5, 198, 264 n.107, 270 n.30
 recaps
 discussion 7, 8, 11, 12, 22
 examples 42, 43, 44, 46, 129, 131, etc.
 recurring character 54, 58
 red-shirt
 definition 12–13
 examples 85, 86, 95–6, 113, 152, 155, 160, 172, 212
 repetition 7, 15, 27, 52, 70, 85, 124, 133, 153, 160, 183, 194, 210, 235 n.5, 243 n.66, 243 n.68
 Richardson, Scott 9
 Sapochnik, Miguel 9
 Sarpedon 49–54, 64, 154, 254 n.63
 and the Achaian wall 112, 158, 264 n.109
 death 147, 148, 152, 158, 214, 267 n.149
 and Glaukos 32, 109, 113, 132, 156, 165, 223, 252 n.25, 260 n.40
 and Hektor 47–8, 51–2, 60, 65, 66, 79, 154–5, 156–7, 223
 and Zeus 112, 135–6, 155, 202, 268 n.160
 scale of affection 67, 210, 257 n.94, 278 n.168
 scales of death (*kerostasia*) 81, 84, 203, 259 n.29
Scandal (ABC, 2012–) 253 n.47
 schema 19, 20, 54, 130, 240 n.33, 247 n.130, 248 n.134
Sense8 (Netflix, 2015–) 17
 serial television 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 25, 27, 63, 130, 237 n.21, 238 n.27, 250 n.1, 255 n.72
 shippers 65
 shuddering (*ῥῑτυ-*) 37, 38, 41, 73–4, 139, 166
 Simoeisios 44
 Skaian gates 91, 159, 182, 198, 223
 Skamandros 29
 Smith, Anthony 12
 Smith, Murray 5, 6
 soap operas 3
 Sokos 103
Song of Fire and Ice 22
Sons of Anarchy (FX, 2008–15?) 3, 244 n.83
The Sopranos, (HBO, 1999–2007) 11, 12–13, 238 n.27, 246 n.100
 spoilers 106, 198, 238 n.25, 250 n.1
Star Trek 12, 233, 234, 237 n.24, 246 n.98, 251 n.23
 Sthenelos 43, 45, 90
 sting scene 226
 storylines 11, 12, 23, 26, 28, 64, 69, 113, 117, 119, 121, 129, 184, 190, 199, 210, 215, 224, 238 n.24, 242 n.60, 245 n.89, 255 n.70
 storyworld 3, 8, 20, 21, 23, 45, 64, 83, 119, 147, 188, 190, 200, 202, 210
 Terror 44
 Teukros 55, 85–7, 97, 116–18, 133, 156, 215

- and Aias 86, 112–13, 119, 123, 139,
265 n.120
- and Hektor 86–7, 97, 115, 118, 138, 140
- Thebe 26, 27, 66, 214
- theomachia* (god-fight) 97, 196–7, 212
- Thersites 28
- Thetis 66, 84, 120, 129, 135, 142, 170, 177–9,
181–3, 195, 205, 223–5, 250 n.12,
273 n.61, 274 n.75, 275 n.107,
277 n.132
- and Achilles 24–7, 136, 149, 177,
217–19, 225
- and Zeus 8, 27, 88, 218, 224, 250 n.12
- Thoas 45, 116, 119, 137, 152, 259 n.30
- Thoön 102, 122
- Thoötes 113
- Thracians 96–7
- Thrasymedes 90, 152, 170, 174, 176
- Thymbraios 101
- Tlepolemos 50–1, 251 n.22, 263 n.81,
267 n.150
- tradition
- epic tradition 7, 24, 40, 66, 74, 80, 83, 89,
127, 128, 143, 188, 189, 199, 207,
233–4, 251 n.16, 252 n.26, 253 n.41,
253 n.47, 257 n.82, 257 n.91, 261 n.52,
262 n.57, 266 n.138, 268 n.177,
274 n.86, 275 n.92, 275 n.93, 275 n.95,
276 n.113, 278 n.156, 279 n.169
- traditional audiences 32, 38, 41, 51, 55,
63, 74, 144, 147–8, 187, 195, 199, 209,
211, 214, 221, 270 n.17, 275 n.97
- traditional material 4, 25, 50, 58, 250 n.5,
273 n.73
- Trojan women 42, 48, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61,
67–8, 77, 81, 83, 89, 99, 161, 162, 202,
204, 208
- and Hektor 59, 73, 166–7, 178, 199,
210, 226
- True Detective* (HBO, 2014-) 3
- Twombly, Cy 21
- type-scenes 69, 153, 258 n.1, 267 n.154
- vocative address 31, 61, 252 n.27,
256 n.79
- see also apostrophe
- The Walking Dead* (AMC, 2010-) 8, 11, 25,
241 n.44, 250 n.5, 256 n.72
- The Wire* (HBO, 2002–8) 6, 67, 78, 242 n.52
- Xanthos (horse) 186, 206
- (river) 54, 132, 188, 192, 194–5, 197,
203, 226
- The X-Files* (FOX, 1993–2002, 2016) 47–8,
270 n.15
- Zeus 8, 24, 28, 50, 54, 86, 90, 94, 123–4, 128,
133, 159, 168–9, 175, 186–7, 190,
267 n.155
- and Athena 52–3, 172, 203
- and Hektor 72–3, 74, 82, 84–6, 89, 93,
99–100, 102, 104, 107, 114, 116–17,
119, 125, 129, 132, 140, 143, 144–5,
150, 153, 160, 162, 164, 166, 167, 171,
173, 178, 180, 193, 202, 205, 216–17,
262 n.59, 263 n.83
- and Hera 27, 40–1, 53, 131, 135, 184,
266 n.141, 267 n.146, 276 n.119
- and Iris 30, 218–19
- and justice 42, 44, 46, 79, 123
- zoom-in 44, 84, 139, 152, 169
- zoom-out 32, 44, 48, 98, 109, 112, 120, 131,
133, 143, 152, 153, 169, 203, 262 n.71

