

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

28.2010

ADOLF M. HAKKERT EDITORE

LEXIS

Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

SOMMARIO

III CONVEGNO DI STUDI ESCHILEI, GELA 21-23 MAGGIO 2009

Giuseppina Basta Donzelli – Vittorio Citti, <i>Introduzione</i>	1
Giovanna Pace, <i>Aesch. 'Pers.' 97-9: problemi metrici e testuali</i>	3
Stefano Amendola, <i>Eschilo 'Pers.' 329</i>	21
Paola Volpe Cacciatore, <i>Eschilo 'Pers.' 813-5 e 829-31</i>	35
Anna Caramico, <i>Il δις ταῦτόν eschileo: forme di pleonasma nel terzo episodio dei 'Persiani' di Eschilo</i>	47
Riccardo Di Donato, <i>Ritualità e teatro nei 'Persiani'</i>	59
Liana Lomiento, <i>L'inno della falsa gioia in Aesch. 'Suppl.' 524-99</i>	67
Matteo Taufer, <i>Aesch. 'PV' 113 πεπασσαλευμένος?</i>	93
Antonella Candio, <i>Aesch. 'Ag.' 7</i>	103
Carles Garriga, <i>Aesch. 'Eum.' 778-93 (=808-23); 837-47 (=870-80)</i>	113
Paolo Cipolla, <i>Il 'frammento di Dike' (Aesch. F 281a R.): uno 'status quaestionis' sui problemi testuali ed esegetici</i>	133
Piero Totaro, <i>Su alcune citazioni eschilee nelle Rane di Aristofane ('Mirmidoni'; 'Agamennone' 104)</i>	155
Véronique Somers, <i>Eschyle dans le 'Christus Patiens'</i>	171
Paolo Tavonatti, <i>Francesco Porto e l'esegesi eschilea nel Rinascimento</i>	185

ARTICOLI

Pietro Pucci, <i>The Splendid Figure of Κῦδος</i>	201
Stefano Caciagli, <i>Il temenos di Messon: un contesto unico per Saffo e Alceo</i>	227
Ioannis M. Konstantakos, <i>Aesop and Riddles</i>	257
Giorgia Parlato, <i>Note di lettura ai 'Cypria': fr. 4.3, 9.1, 32.2 Bernabé</i>	291
Mattia De Poli, <i>Odiseo, Oreste e l'ospite-supplice. Nota testuale a Eur. 'Cycl.' 368-71 e Aesch. 'Eum.' 576-8 (e 473-4)</i>	299
Francesco Mambrini, <i>Il lamento di Eribea: Sofocle, 'Aiace' 624-34</i>	309
Marta F. Di Bari, <i>'Οδ' ἐκείνο: Aristofane, 'Cavalieri' 1331, 'Nuvole' 116</i>	329
Renato Oniga, <i>I fondamenti linguistici della metrica latina arcaica</i>	343
Nicola Piacenza, <i>«Come una rana contro i grilli»: note in margine ad una metafora teocritea ('Id.' 7.37-42)</i>	369
Fulvio Beschi, <i>Archia: tre note sugli epigrammi</i>	377
Andrea Filippetti, <i>Cicerone e Sallustio: l'effictio di Catilina</i>	385
Alberto Cavarzere, <i>La veste sonora di Hor. 'carm.' 1.1.36</i>	395
Nadia Scippacercola, <i>La violenza nel romanzo greco</i>	399
Eulogio Baeza Angulo, <i>'Quid istic pudibunda iaces, pars pessima nostris?' La impotencia como motivo literario en el mundo clásico</i>	433
Maria Cecilia Angioni, <i>L'Orestea nell'edizione di Robortello da Udine (1552)</i>	465
Chiara Tedeschi, <i>Le fonti di Thomas Stanley, editore di Eschilo</i>	479
Jean Robaey, <i>Racine, 'Iphigénie', Acte 1, Scène 1: un exercice de philologie comparée</i> ...	505
Alfonso Traina, <i>«Me iuvat in prima coluisse Heliconia iuventa!» (note al latino di Sainte-Beuve e di Musset)</i>	535

RECENSIONI

L. Battezzato, <i>Linguistica e retorica della tragedia greca</i> (A. Candio).....	543
G. Mastromarco – P. Totaro (ed.), <i>Commedie di Aristofane. Volume II</i> (T. Gargiulo).....	546
G. Mastromarco – P. Totaro, <i>Storia del teatro greco</i> (M. Tauffer).....	550
Q. Cataudella, <i>Platone orale</i> , a cura di D. Cilia e P. Cipolla (S. Maso).....	552
M. Fattal, <i>Le langage chez Platon. Autour du 'Sophiste'</i> (S. Maso).....	555
G. Movia, <i>Alessandro di Afrodizia e Pseudo Alessandro. Commentario alla 'Metafisica' di Aristotele</i> (S. Maso).....	558
L. Savignago, <i>Eisthesis. Il sistema dei margini nei papiri dei poeti tragici</i> (G. Galvani)...	561
F. Pagnotta, <i>Cicerone e l'ideale dell' 'aequabilitas'</i> (L. Garofalo).....	568
E. Narducci, <i>Cicerone. La parola e la politica</i> (P. Mastandrea).....	572
P. Fedeli – I. Ciccarelli (ed.), <i>Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina Liber IV</i> (A. Cucchiarelli).....	575
G. Salanitro, <i>Silloge dei 'Vergiliocentones Minores'</i> (P. Mastandrea).....	581
D. Dana, <i>Zalmoxis de la Herodot la Mircea Eliade. Istorie despre un zeu al pretextului</i> (M. Tauffer)..	583
E. Narducci – S. Audano – L. Fezzi (ed.), <i>Aspetti della Fortuna dell'Antico nella Cultura Europea</i> (C. Franco).....	589
Maria Grazia Falconeri, <i>Sulla traduzione</i>	591

Direzione

VITTORIO CITTI
PAOLO MASTANDREA

Redazione

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI, CLAUDIA CASALI, LIA DE FINIS, CARLO FRANCO, ALESSANDRO FRANZOI, MASSIMO MANCA, STEFANO MASO, LUCA MONDIN, GABRIELLA MORETTI, MARIA ANTONIETTA NENCINI, PIETRO NOVELLI, STEFANO NOVELLI, RENATO ONIGA, ANTONIO PISTELLATO, GIANCARLO SCARPA, LINDA SPINAZZÈ, MATTEO TAUFER

Comitato scientifico

MARIA GRAZIA BONANNO, ANGELO CASANOVA, ALBERTO CAVARZERE, GENNARO D'IPPOLITO, LOWELL EDMUNDS, PAOLO FEDELI, ENRICO FLORES, PAOLO GATTI, MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO, GIAN FRANCO GIANOTTI, PIERRE JUDET DE LA COMBE, MARIE MADELEINE MACTOUX, GIUSEPPE MASTROMARCO, GIANCARLO MAZZOLI, CARLES MIRALLES, GIAN FRANCO NIEDDU, CARLO ODO PAVESE, WOLFGANG RÖSLER, PAOLO VALESIO, MARIO VEGETTI, BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica

<http://www.lexisonline.eu/>
info@lexisonline.eu

Direzione e Redazione:

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e del Vicino Oriente
Palazzo Malcanton Marcorà – Dorsoduro 3484/D
I-30123 Venezia

Vittorio Citti vittorio.citti@lett.unitn.it

Paolo Mastandrea mast@unive.it

Publicato con il contributo del
Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e Vicino Oriente
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Copyright by Vittorio Citti
ISSN 2210-8823

The Splendid Figure of Κῦδος

Recently Dominique Jaillard has focused on the function of *kydos* in Homer¹, correcting and developing some of the points that through a pioneering analysis Emile Benveniste had brought to light². Through a magisterial and subtle inquiry, Jaillard is able to define exactly the singular nature and function of *kydos*; he writes: «Le *kydos* n'est pas un pouvoir "magique" – here Jaillard correctly contests Benveniste's definition of *kydos* as 'magic power', a definition that had given the title to the whole chapter – d'une autre nature que la *puissance* qu'un dieu exerce dans son champ de compétence. Il est cette *puissance même* dans son actualisation, son exercice, sa manifestation et son rayonnement»³.

I agree with this definition, but I feel that it is useful to extract from its density two details: (1) inasmuch as it is a «manifestation» of the divine power, *kydos* functions also as a 'sign', and as a sign it suffers the semantic intricacies of all 'signs'; it can be manipulated; (2) inasmuch as it is a «manifestation» of the divine power and radiance, *kydos* brings gods, Zeus especially, into action and allows them to accomplish their plans. In granting or denying *kydos*, while a few heroes hope for *kydos*, gods come near to men, and collaborate with them. To this extent sometimes *kydos* sometimes functions as an epiphany-carrier sign.

In the analysis that follows I will take these two points into account.

My main purpose, however, is to analyze how this epic device frames in different ways the few characters who receive the grace of divine *kydos*. Both Benveniste and Jaillard have studied the examples of *kydos* across the whole of epic poetry, distinguishing the various syntactical and semantic contexts (*kydos* as a predicate, hope for, promise of *kydos*, conditional bestowal of *kydos*, effective enactment of *kydos*, etc.) As the reader will see, the different ways in which the text elaborates this epic device for the gods, Achilles, Hector and Diomedes⁴ are most instructive. For this distinctive device, though in many ways elusive as concerns its meaning and semantic span, characterizes, among other things, the specific relation between gods and the main heroes, and suggests the different sorts of assistance, privilege and success the divine presence grants to heroes and the different visibility of their deeds.

There are four passages in which *kydos* seems to produce a shine: in all these passages the *kydos* is assigned to gods; *kydos* is their own prerogative and it is described through two syntactical segments at the end of the line:

καθέζετο κύδει γαίῳ

¹ Jaillard 2007.

² Benveniste 1969, 57-69.

³ Jaillard 2007, 95.

⁴ Other heroes could conditionally get *kydos*, or hope for *kydos*, or are promised *kydos*: Agamemnon (Δ.415), Ajax (Μ.407), Pandaros (Δ.95), Patroclus (Π.88, 241), Menelaos (Γ.373), but in fact this bliss does not occur.

He sat shining in his might⁵.

In this precise posture and glowing halo, three gods are described: Briareus sitting close to Zeus after having saved him (A.405), Ares sitting close to his father, fully restored to his authority, after suffering defeat by Diomedes (E.906), and Zeus himself, sitting on the peak of Ida (Θ.51), and sitting far away from the other gods (Λ.81). Since Briareus does not constitute a divine presence as a character in the *Iliad*, it is significant – as we will see – that beside Zeus only Ares, among all the gods, is described in the glowing, shining halo of his might (κύδεϊ γαίῳν).

There is a group of examples in which *kydos* is part of the vocative noun-epithet phrase for a hero:

ὦ Νέστορ Νηληϊάδῃ μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν (K.87, 555, Λ.511, Ξ.42, γ.79, 202)

and

εἶπ' ἄγε μ' ὦ πολύαιν' Ὀδυσσεῦ μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν. (I.673, K.544, μ.184)

The traditional translation of *kydos* in these passages «great glory of the Achaeans» has been abandoned in favor of ‘support’ (as intellectual power), or ‘pillar’, ‘ornament’ (Führer).

Another small group of examples shows *kydos* as a predicate of a hero, as in X.435 where Hecabe in her praise before Hector’s corpse says:

ἦ γὰρ καί σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα
ζῶος ἐόν·

For them you were their greatest splendor (or might, majesty, magnificence [‘Prunkstück’, Führer]) while you lived.

The meaning and function of *kydos* as a predicate are problematic especially in view of the principle often recognizable in the Homeric usage, and strongly asserted by Benveniste and Jaillard, that *kydos* is not a permanent privilege: it disappears with the god’s withdrawing of his/her help and does not survive the hero’s death.

⁵ The traditional translation of *kydos* in these and in most of the other passages has consistently been ‘glory’, but in recent years the arguments of Benveniste 1969, of Fränkel 1973, 80. n. 14, and P. Chantraine *DELG* have finally been heard. R. Führer in *LfgRE* proposes for the four quoted passages «im Vollbesitz seiner Stärke» (in full possession of his might), and Latacz *HIGK* translates A 405 as «der setze sich dicht neben Zeus, sich seiner Hoheit freuend», while in the *Commentary* he writes: «im Gefühl des stolzen Selbstzufriedenheit» (Latacz 1966, 130). Jaillard 2007, 93, has an effective description «L’expression κύδεϊ γαίῳν semble marquer...la relation qui unit le *kydos* à l’exercice d’un pouvoir effectif, actuel dans le quel et à partir duquel le dieu resplendit et exulte, à l’exercice plénier par le dieu de sa part des *timai*». The precise meaning of γαίῳν remains vague: Chantraine in *DELG* translates with: ‘rayonnant’ and he connects this participle to γάνυμαι, γάνος etc. In the quoted Jaillard’s passage, see «resplendit et exulte».

But once *kydos* has become an integral part of a vocative noun-epithet phrase or of a heroic portrait, it is consigned to the permanence of *kleos* and therefore it is not perishable.

I come now to the three heroes who are blessed by divine *kydos*. This blessing already distinguishes them from all the other heroes as the most important warriors in the plot and action of the *Iliad*.

Outside the Games, Diomedes has *kydos* bestowed on him only twice (E.225, 260), and in both cases in a conditional context. In the first passage Aeneas is speaking with Pandaros about the famous horses of Tros and telling him that they will save «us if Zeus again⁶ grants *kydos* to Diomedes, son of Tydeus»:

τὸν καὶ νόϊ πόλινδε σαώσετον, εἴ περ ἄν αὔτε
Ζεὺς ἐπὶ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ κῦδος ὀρέξῃ.

225

It is clear that Aeneas does not know that Athena participates directly in Diomedes' success. He therefore assumes that this success depends on Zeus who is the supreme authority⁷.

In fact it is Athena's direct partnership with Diomedes that explains the rarity of the theme of *kydos*: she does not need to 'give' him splendid might, she enacts it for him, for instance by guiding his spear against Pandaros (E.290 ff.).

Diomedes' deeds are so exceptional and surpassing human measure that Aeneas himself assumes that Diomedes might not be Diomedes, but a god in disguise (E.177 s.). Analogously, Pandaros suspects that Diomedes is helped by an invisible god (E.187ff.) – which is the reality. In fact he quotes the evidence for this miraculous assistance: his dart hit Diomedes but it did not kill him: on the contrary Diomedes had returned to fight with more vigor.

Aeneas' assumption that Zeus grants *kydos* to Diomedes derives from the fact that Diomedes is visibly possessed by a sort of divine might, a supernatural power.

The visibility, the ostensible excess of such a possession was announced by the *diegesis* at the beginning of the song, though not through the device of *kydos*:

Ἔνθ'⁸ αὖ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
δῶκε μένος καὶ θάρσος⁹, ἴν' ἔκδηλος¹⁰ μετὰ πᾶσιν
Ἀργείοισι γένοιτο ἰδὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιο·

⁶ Through the help of Athena, Diomedes return to the fight with more vigor and violence after being wounded by Pandaros (E.133 ff.).

⁷ As Jørgensen 1904 has shown, the characters attribute to Zeus what the Narrator knows to be the intervention or the competence of specific gods.

⁸ For ἔνθα descriptive, referring to a point in the narrative, but not to reality, see Bakker 1997, 69.

⁹ θάρσος is always granted by the gods, by Athena (P.570, α.321, γ.76, ξ.216 etc.) Apollo (Φ.547), the *daimon* (ι.381); or it is a quality of Ares, the god himself being defined by Athena as a dogfly (Φ.394).

¹⁰ ἔκδηλος is hapax in Homer.

Now, Pallas Athena gave to Diomedes, son of Tydeus, furor and daring in order to make him conspicuous among all the Argives and for him to acquire noble glory.

It seems that the first condition for obtaining the attention of the poet who will celebrate the hero and granting him *kleos* is for the hero to become visible and distinguished among all his peers (see *infra*). This condition of conspicuousness and visibility of the hero is obtained here by the divine granting of μένος και θάρσος; this bestowal is somehow comparable with the giving of *kydos*¹¹.

There is an immediate material luminosity surrounding the hero possessed by divine μένος και θάρσος: Athena kindles fire from Diomedes' helmet and shield (v. 4) which allows the diegesis to follow with a simile:

δαῖε οἱ ἐκ κόρυθός τε και ἀσπίδος ἀκάματον πῦρ
ἀστέρ' ὄπωρινῶ ἐναλίγκιον, ὅς τε μάλιστα 5
λαμπρὸν παμφαίνησι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο·
τοῖόν οἱ πῦρ δαῖεν ἀπὸ κρατός τε και ὤμων,

She kindled infatigable fire from his helm and shield similar to the star of the Fall that over all the others shines and beams when it has been washed in the Ocean. Such was the fire that she kindled from the head and the shoulder of Diomedes.

Diomedes' heroic image gains fame and glory (*kleos*) because of his luminous icon and the ostentatious picture of his splendid might. If the Muses vouchsafe the production of the narrative as heroic *kleos*, Athena and Zeus produce the luminous icons that are worthy to be sung and transmitted¹².

The second instance in which *kydos* is related to Diomedes is at E.259 ff. where the hero, after saying that one of his enemies, Pandaros and Aeneas, may save himself, has a moment of reflection and adds:

ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν·
αἶ κέν μοι πολύβουλος Ἀθήνη κῦδος ὀρέξῃ 260
ἀμφοτέρω κτείνειαι, σὺ δὲ τοῦσδε μὲν ὠκέας ἵππους [...]

¹¹ «Considerable emphasis is placed on the gleam emanating from Diomedes' armor [...]The armor's gleam [...] is particularly significant for indicating the subsequent success of a hero as he begins his *aristeia*.» Louden 2006, 17 f. As Louden remarks, blazing fire – like a star's – surrounds also Achilles' head in Σ.206 ff. suggesting a parallel status between the two heroes. A gleam of a star characterizes also Hector's armor in Λ.62 f. As the fire Athena kindles around Diomedes' head is compared to that of a star, it acquires a divine connotation. The three characters are again reunited by narrative links.

¹² «L''être lumineux c'est être perçu. C'est donc l'être révélé par la lumière qui en le rendant visible l'offre à la vision. C'est le héros comme "idéalisation de l'homme" et comme miroir du divin. Son éclat est celui, problématique, de l'individualisation héroïque.» Cany 2001, 183.

But I will tell you another thing and put it in your mind: if rich in counsel Athena gives me the *kydos* (splendid might) of killing them both, you then stop here these horses of mine [...]¹³.

Diomedes knows that Athena is helping him – she has spoken to him at line E.121 ff. – and even if he has seen her departing (E.134), he had enough encouragement to believe in her support. In fact he still perceives the *menos* that she injected in him (E.254) and asserts that «Athena does not allow me to be afraid» (256). Truly Athena does more than inspire him, she even guides his spear through the nose and the mouth of Pandaros (290 ff.).

Diomedes, then, would have easily achieved the purpose for which he requested *kydos* (splendid might) from Athena, had not Aphrodite rescued Aeneas when he was already wounded and knocked out. In view of the several cases in which the presence of divine *kydos*, as we will see, ensures only partial success, this example should be noted.

Athena takes Diomedes' affairs in her hands: she does grant Diomedes the icon of visible might and accordingly the avenue to his *kleos* at no cost to him, as a munificent radiation of her power. This is striking when it is contrasted with the price Achilles pays for his *kleos* (I.412-6, Σ.121), and with the relative vanity of Hector's several partial victories.

Athena takes again an active role when she collaborates with Achilles in the defeat of Hector. She appears to Achilles¹⁴ and tells him (X.216 ff.):

νῦν δὴ νῶϊ ἔολπα Διὶ φίλε φαιδίμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ
οἴσεσθαι μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιοῖσι προτὶ νῆας
Ἔκτορα δηώσαντε μάχης ἄατόν περ ἔοντα.
οὐ οἱ νῦν ἔτι γ' ἔστι πεφυγμένον ἄμμε γενέσθαι,
οὐδ' εἴ κεν μάλα πολλὰ πάθοι ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων
προπροκυλινδόμενος πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο. 220
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν στήθι καὶ ἄμπνε, τόνδε δ' ἐγὼ τοι
οἴχομένη πεπιθήσω ἐναντίβιον μαχέσασθαι.

Now I expect, shining Achilles, dear to Zeus, that we will bring (the prize of) our great triumph (*kydos*) to the ships of the Achaeans, as we kill Hector, though he is insatiate of battle; now it is no longer possible that he escapes us, not even if far-darting Apollo should go through many troubles groveling over and over before our father Zeus,

¹³ Jaillard 2007, 89, underlines in the expression «the *kydos* of killing» the momentary and transitory aspect of *kydos*. Perhaps the poet has Diomedes choosing this expression because of the enormity of the deed he hopes to accomplish, to kill both Pandaros and Aeneas: two champions so powerful and terrifying that Sthenelos had advised Diomedes to avoid them (E.241 ff.). Diomedes knows that for this excessive purpose he needs 'splendid might' from Athena. His awareness of the enormity of his desire would also explain the tentative, conditional mode of his request.

¹⁴ Athena appears to Achilles through the motif ἀγχοῦ δ' ἴσταμένη (B.165 ff. O.236 ff. etc.). The text never says in what shape she appears to him; it is obvious only that he recognizes her immediately.

the aegis-bearer. But now you stop and take a breath. I will go and persuade this man to confront you in fight¹⁵.

Here *kydos* is found in a difficult construction with οἴσεσθαι. This verb, in the middle form, suggests the winning of a prize by killing Hector (Ἔκτορα δηώσαντε), but the assertion that «we will bring to the ships the great *kydos*, for the Achaeans» implies that they will bring the prize of their *kydos*, i.e. the armor and Hector's corpse itself to the ships¹⁶.

The meaning of *kydos* here inclines toward the connotation of 'success' (Führer translates with 'Erfolg'), 'victory', 'triumph', just as in the next passage X.393. As the word does not imply the actual exercise of a splendid might, it is not accompanied by the usual accoutrements of visibility, alarm of the contenders and superhuman deeds some of which marked Diomedes' *kydos*.

The dual form of the participle Ἔκτορα δηώσαντε (picking up νόη on v. 216) is a salient feature of the passage because it implies that Achilles and Athena act as a couple with the same responsibility and purpose. Though Athena raises no hand against Hector's body, yet she claims to be one of the two who will kill Hector; and Achilles himself announces to Hector: «Pallas Athena will kill you with my spear» (270 f. and see 445 f.¹⁷). Accordingly, in this enactment of *kydos*, as enactment of the splendid victory over Hector, the figure of Achilles and that of Athena are in some way superimposed upon each other. In Athena's expression: «as we kill Hector», we see Achilles's complicity even in her act of deceiving Hector. As this superimposition shows, the actual enactment of *kydos* becomes colored by the figure and prerogatives of the goddess.

Athena's interventions produce no visible shine but a sort of supernatural suspension of temporality in an out-of-the-present-world parenthesis: Achilles suddenly ceases running – no surprise to Hector, but of course we are surprised that Hector fails to

¹⁵ The negative connotation that Sachs 1987, 141 uncovers in the phrase φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ (216) might not be active here since it is coupled with Διὶ φίλῃ in a combination that is unique in the *Iliad*. Though Διὶ φίλῃ is a generic epithet (A.74 for Calchas, Λ.611 for Patroclus, etc.), here it sounds contextualized: Zeus sent Athena to help Achilles in whatever way she wants (X.185). The phrase (or module μάχης ἄατόν περ ἐόντα (218) is unique for Hector in the *Iliad* and here sounds doubly strange since Hector has run away from the battle with Achilles. Notice that Athena will have to persuade him to fight τόνδε δ' ἐγώ τοι / οἰχομένη πεπιθήσω ἐναντίβιον μαχέσασθαι (223). Besides it is not sure what value, causal or concessive, the participle has (see Bakker 1988, 134-7).

¹⁶ «The peculiarity of the phrase lies in the addition of προτὶ νῆας which shows that οἴσεσθαι means "bring" non merely "win" as in the common κράτος φέρεσθαι, etc.» (Leaf 1902, 363).

¹⁷ On the ritual antagonism of Achilles-Apollo and Hector-Athena in this passage, see Nagy 1979, 144.

notice it – Achilles passively awaits, Hector meets one whom he takes to be Deiphobos, but who is not: they exchange leisurely conversation, speaking loud words to each other – we are reminded of the same out-of-the-present-world parenthesis in Athena’s epiphany in the first book – and, only after all this, the action-in-this-world resumes¹⁸.

After the killing of Hector, Achaean soldiers join Achilles in singing together a paean¹⁹ (X.393 f.):

ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος· ἐπέφνομεν Ἐκτορα δῖον,
ὃ Τρῶες κατὰ ἄστῃ θεῶ ὡς εὐχετόωντο.

We have won a great triumph; we killed godlike Hector whom the Trojans worshipped in the city as a god.²⁰

As we turn to Hector’s *kydos* we realize two specific features: (1) in the act of exercising *kydos* that comes to him from Zeus, the accoutrement that accompanies it is often mentioned as consistent with the powers of the Storm-god; (2) by a problematic strategy, the text manages to identify Hector’s warlike fury in the actualization of *kydos* with that of Ares. Now, in the *Iliad*, Ares symbolizes defeat: the shocking strategy therefore consists in coupling in the same context the icon of victory with that of defeat.

In Θ.141, 215-5, 348-50, Zeus gives *kydos* to Hector during various phases of the fight. The god, acting as the Storm-god that he is, begins by sending a terrible thunder and a blinding lightening before Diomedes’ horses: (132 ff.) «and there arose a terrible flame of sulfur burning, and the two horses were frightened ... the shining reins dropped from Nestor’s hands²¹», and just as we saw in book E, when Pandaros and Aeneas recognize the assistance of a god, so here Nestor speaks to Diomedes (140-4):

¹⁸ Some critics continue to be certain that Athena appears – as Richardson 1993, 130, writes – «in her own person, as he [Achilles] recognizes her at once.» The reason that justifies this certainty is trivial: who else could appear to Achilles along that swift race around the walls of Troy except a god? And which other god could utter those words to Achilles except Athena? Could her helmet or any part of her armor provide a supplementary sign of recognition? Writing that Athena appears «in her own person» writes off the problematic question of how the gods would reduce, or manage their shine, stature, and shape – the features of their divine body – when they interact with men (see Υ.131, and the large bibliography on this question in the remarkable and very useful book of Piettre 1996, 2-29).

¹⁹ It is a song of rejoicing not necessarily dedicated to Apollo who is Hector’s ritual champion.

²⁰ The powerful asyndeton singles out the slaying of Hector. The characterization of Hector in line 394 enhances the magnitude of the deed. Hecabe will assure that the worship of Hector was a fact, see X.434 f.

²¹ Lightning and thunder are for the fighters the signs of a defeat: they indeed interpret the world as a constellation of signs. See, for the structure of the ‘reversal passages’, Bakker 1997, 178-80.

ἦ οὐ γινώσκεις ὅ τοι ἐκ Διὸς οὐχ ἔπετ' ἀλκή;
 νῦν μὲν γὰρ τούτῳ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει
 σήμερον· ὕστερον αὖτε καὶ ἡμῖν, αἴ κ' ἐθέλησι,
 δώσει· ἀνὴρ δέ κεν οὐ τι Διὸς νόον εἰρύσσαιτο
 οὐδὲ μάλ' ἴφθιμος, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστι.

[...] don't you see that no help comes from Zeus, for now it is to him [Hector] that Zeus grants²² splendid might (*kydos*), for the day; after this day he will give it again to us, if he wants: a man cannot oppose the will of Zeus, even if he is very strong, since Zeus is really much stronger.

We have to recall, before we approach this text, that 90 lines before Zeus has been described as sitting on the mountain-tops exulting in his feeling of might to behold the city of the Trojans and the ships of the Achaeans:

αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κορυφῆσι καθέζετο κύδει γαίων²³

It would not be a mere speculative idea, I think, to see a link between Zeus' rejoicing in the consciousness of his might and his extending a radiation of it to whomever he wants.

On this occasion it is Hector who receives this might. Its visibility and its display are so obvious and unconquerable that Nestor and Diomedes (the latter with tremendous regret) flee from Hector²⁴.

What follows is a rain of spears on the Achaeans, Hector's boast and insults against Diomedes, Zeus' new thunder in favour of Hector (three times, μητίετα Ζεὺς thundered, 170); Hector's shouts all over the battle field, and he screams «I know that Kronos' son has nodded in assent granting me victory and superior might (*kydos*), but ruin to the Danaans» (Θ.175 f.):

γινώσκω δ' ὅτι μοι πρόφρων κατένευσε Κρονίων
 νίκην καὶ μέγα κῦδος, ἀτὰρ Δαναοῖσί γε πῆμα·

His boasts and his threats to the ships fill Hera with indignation but she fails to obtain Poseidon's help (198-212). Meanwhile Hector leads the attack of the Trojans against the wall in order to reach and burn the ships of the Achaeans (215-7):

²² On this use of ὀπάζειν as 'give as a companion', 'to give from the gods' as an expression of *Hel-dendichtung*, see Dettori 1988-89, 65 f.

²³ Benveniste 1969, 60 f., interprets this *kydos* as «talisman de suprématie»; *LfrgE* translates «in full possession of his might»; Jaillard 2007, 93, as we have seen, emphasizes in this expression κύδει γαίων «le resplendissement et l'exultance du dieu à l'exercice plénier de ses *timai*». My translation «feeling of might» underscores the consciousness that Zeus has of possessing an unconquerable might. Even the heroes are aware of being graced by a superior might.

²⁴ See Nestor's question: «Don't you see...». *Kydos* is made visible, even glaring by the manifestations Zeus has sent: a blinding lightning before Diomedes' horses; a terrible flame of sulfur burning, etc. It is impossible to say whether the visibility and display of Hector's superior might shines also in him as a halo or is simply registered by the Achaeans from the divine signs sent by Zeus.

εἴλει δὲ θεῶν ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ
Ἐκτῶρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκε.
Καὶ νύ κ' ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέῳ νῆας ἔϊσας,

Thus Hector, Priam's son, equal²⁵ to rushing Ares pushed them, since²⁶ Zeus gave him splendid might (*kydos*)²⁷: and now he would have burnt with blazing fire²⁸ the well balanced ships [...].

For the third time in so few lines, Zeus grants *kydos* to Hector, but now the text attributes a figure to Hector's superior and splendid might: he is equal to rushing Ares²⁹. In the two lines the text invites the audience to look upon Hector through two opposite evaluations: at the level of his and Zeus' knowledge of the action, the text shows him aware of being empowered by Zeus with splendid and victorious might, but at the level of the audience's awareness, the text, through the simile with Ares announces a reversal of Hector's might and victory. Hector and Zeus do not know the symbolic connotation of the figure of Ares, but the audience not only knows it, but the text, by a defiant strategy, immediately assures its audience that they are right if they take the simile with Ares as a secret wink to them suggesting Hector's defeat, since the action proves it: «for he would have burnt the well-balanced ships with blazing fire, had not lady Hera put in the mind of Agamemnon, out on the run already, to rouse the Achaeans swiftly.» (Θ.217-9). In short, as what follows shows, there is a reversal of the military situation. The simile with Ares proves the point³⁰.

This paradoxical and shocking textual ambivalence returns several other times.

A renewed mention of Zeus' support for Hector in Θ.335 ff.: «And now again the Olympian aroused the spirit of the Trojans. So they drove the Achaeans straight to the deep trench and amid the foremost went Hector exulting in his might (337:

²⁵ Chantraine *DELG* paraphrases this adjective with «equivalent».

²⁶ ὅτε: Ameis – Hentze 1930, *ad l.* interpret it with a more salient causal shade than temporal.

²⁷ The Scholiasts face the divine help to Hector in curious ways, sometimes, as in this case, consider it as a way for the Narrator to belittle Hector's own warlike prowess, other times as way for the Narrator to lighten the blame against the losers (see for instance Θ.335): both strategies reveal the Scholiasts' philhellenic animus.

²⁸ Perhaps πυρὶ plays with a certain assonance on Πριαμίδης.

²⁹ Other heroes occasionally resemble (rushing, murderous) Ares (for instance Meriones, N.295, 328, 528, who is never blessed by *kydos*, Patroclus Π.784: who knows *kydos*; Achilles himself is viewed by the Trojans as similar to murderous Ares, Υ.46): the differences with Hector, and his singularity will become progressively clear.

³⁰ As Ares has been defeated twice, once by Diomedes and Athena and the second time by Athena, he has written the word 'defeat' on his own body and name. Kelly 2007, 229 shows that the assimilation of any hero with Ares has negative meanings: he analyzes the 26 Ares similes in the *Iliad* and concludes: «Whatever the simile's form, there is a consistent connotation of secondary status or ineffectiveness surrounding the characters so compared. This concurs well with Ares' general press in the *Iliad*».

σθένει βλεμαίνων³¹)» is followed a few lines later, by the image of Hector's eyes similar to the Gorgon's and Ares' eyes in Θ.348 f.:

Ἐκτῶρ δ' ἀμφιπεριστρώφα καλλίτριχας ἵππους
Γοργοῦς ὄμματ' ἔχων ἠδὲ βροτολοιοῦ Ἄρηος.

Hector swerved his gorgeously-manned horses round, having the glance of the Gorgon and of men-murderous Ares.

The selection of the two divine creatures is important: Zeus' gift of *kydos* transforms Hector's eyes/glance into those of the Gorgon and Ares. Now, the Gorgon's head crowns, with other monsters, Zeus' aegis (E.741): the link between Gorgon, Zeus and Hector cannot be casual, but it suggests a transference of might and prerogatives from Zeus to Hector.

The glance of the Gorgon produces a sort of paralysis and in fact the Achaeans are described as ceasing the fight, raising their hands and praying to the gods (Θ.346).

But here too Hector's splendid might fails to lead him to any victory: the narrative moves to Olympus until night descends on earth, bringing displeasure to the Trojans, but blessing to the Achaeans (Θ.487 f.).

The physical assimilation of Ares' and Hector's glance/eyes suggests that Hector fights as a sort of Ares: his eyes are meant to be full of fire as in O.607 f. where he is compared to Ares³².

This assimilation with Ares is made even more explicit in P.210, when Hector puts on Achilles' armor. Zeus realizes that Hector's demise is close and that Hector's proud gesture reveals his terrible self-deception. Nevertheless Zeus nods in assent, and promises to bestow on him great force (ἀτάρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω, P.206)³³. Even if *kratos* does not carry the same solemnity and intensity of splendor as *kydos*, this difference is not meaningful for the purpose of showing

³¹ This expression is found only for Hector (Θ.337, I.237), for Hephaistos (Υ.36) and for animals in heroic similes (M.42, P.22 and 135): it is difficult to appreciate fully the importance of this stylistic feature: the expression σθένει βλεμαίνων is comparable in its undetermined sense and style (at the end of the line) to κύδει γαίω that, as we have seen, is used only for gods (twice for Zeus). Here it emphasizes Hector's feeling of might, possibly his display of pride, and this display has to be connected again with Zeus' gift of *kydos*, the charismatic might, the conquering splendor, etc.

³² «Burning eyes are a normal sign of battle-madness (8.349, 12.466), of Hector» Janko 1991, 295. Achilles' eyes are also described as shining light with flashes of fire at T.365 f.

³³ This locution is not exactly the same as, for instance, Ἐκτορι κῦδος [...] ἐγγυαλίξε (O.644), but in a few cases the *kratos*-locution covers exactly the same context, connotation and value as the *kydos*-locutions. In one case the two locutions seem to have no difference. Compare Λ.192 f. (Zeus is speaking), τότε οἱ κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω / κτείνειν εἰς ὃ κε νῆας εὐσσελίμους ἀφίκηται, and P.453 f., ἔτι γάρ σφισι κῦδος ὀρέξω / κτείνειν, εἰς ὃ κε νῆας εὐσσελίμους ἀφίκηται. In the former passage Hector is the receiver of power, in the second the Trojans: the speaker is in both cases Zeus. Other passages in which the locution with *kratos* covers that of *kydos* are A.508-10, Λ.319, where *kratos* stands for *kydos* of Λ.300.

that when Zeus grants a winning power to Hector, the image of Ares appears (P.209-14):

Ἦ, καὶ κυανέησιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων.
Ἐκτορι δ' ἦρμοσε τεύχε' ἐπὶ χροῖ, δῦ δέ μιν Ἄρης 210
δεινὸς ἐνυάλιος³⁴, πλησθεν δ' ἄρα οἱ μέλε' ἐντὸς
ἀλλκῆς καὶ σθένεος· μετὰ δὲ κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους
βῆ ῥα μέγα ἰάχων· ἰνδάλλετο δέ σφισι πᾶσι
τεύχεσι λαμπόμενος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος³⁵.

So he spoke and the son of Kronos nodded in assent with his dark brows. He fitted the armor tightly on Hector's body³⁶ and Ares entered into him, terrible, warlike; thus Hector's limbs were filled with valor and strength. He sped among the noble allies with a mighty shout, flashing before them all in the gleaming armor of great-hearted son of Peleus.

The Scholiast takes 'Ares' here simply as «warlike passion» (*polemike epithymia*)³⁷, but the physical action of entering the body of Hector implies a direct grasp: the god of war takes possession of Hector's body with all his divine force, behavior and fury. There is a sort of superimposition of Hector and Ares, and the god therefore appears in the image of Hector. It is not a neat epiphany of Ares, but a sort of a superimposed one, a supplemented one, as Hector is becoming Ares.

Here the textual paradox becomes too obvious to ignore: the contrast between Zeus giving Hector winning power and the negative intimation that the narrative produces by introducing Ares' madness and fury in Hector's body is unique for Hector and designs a specific paradox and a perverse strategy.

Before we discuss the narrative's reasons and consequences of this paradox let us see other passages in which Hector is assimilated in various ways with the figure of Ares, just while he is blessed by the radiant might of *kydos*. A very illuminating illustration of this textual strategy occurs in O.596-612:

Ἐκτορι γάρ οἱ θυμὸς ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι 596
Πριαμίδη, ἵνα νηυσὶ κορωνίσσι θεσπιδαῆς πῦρ³⁸
ἐμβάλοι ἀκάματον³⁹,

³⁴ Here the enjambement of the two adjectives seems to me to add emphasis. See note 39.

³⁵ The large noun+epithet for Achilles closing the line and the passage foretells to the audience the menacing presence of Hector's killer. For this noun+epithet see Higbie 1990, 54 f.

³⁶ The Scholiast remarks that the armor has been worn by many fighters, Peleus, Achilles, Patroclus and now Hector: it must therefore have been shaped and fashioned by Hephaistos as able to fit everybody.

³⁷ The exegetic *scholia bT* generally produce allegorical interpretations.

³⁸ Πριαμίδη, at the beginning of the line, has a sort of assonance with πῦρ that stands at the end of the line: see also note 28.

³⁹ The enjambements of adjectives in Homer have raised different critical evaluations, some readers recognizing some emphasis in this device, others denying it: see for instance Bergson 1956, 41;

[...]
 τὰ φρονέων νήεσσιν ἔπι γλαφυρῆσιν ἔγειρεν
 Ἔκτορα Πριαμίδην μάλα περ μεμαῶτα καὶ αὐτόν.
 μαίνεται δ' ὡς ὅτ' Ἄρης ἐγγέσπαλος ἢ ὄλοόν πῦρ 605
 οὔρεσι μαίνεται βαθέης ἐν τάρφεσιν ὕλης
 [...]
 αὐτὸς γάρ οἱ ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἦεν ἀμύντωρ 610
 Ζεὺς, ὅς μιν πλεόνεσσι μετ' ἀνδράσι μοῦνον ἐόντα
 τίμα καὶ κύδαινε. μινυνθάδιος γὰρ ἔμελλεν
 ἔσσεσθ'· ἦδη γάρ οἱ ἐπόρνευε μόρσιμον ἦμαρ
 Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη ὑπὸ Πηλεΐδαο βίηφιν.

His [Zeus'] heart wished to grant splendid might to Hector, Priam's son, so that he might hurl god-kindled, unquenchable fire upon the beaked ships.

[...]
 With this plan in mind, he [Zeus] was rousing Hector against the hollow ships, Priam's son, who himself was already intensely eager; and he was raging just as when spear-brandishing Ares or a destructive fire rages in the hills, in the folds of a deep woodland⁴⁰.

[...]
 For Zeus himself, directly from heaven, was his [Hector's] ally and it was him alone among so many fighters that Zeus was honoring and bestowing on him splendid might. For he was to be short of life, yes, and already Pallas Athena was speeding against him the fatal day at the hands of the son of Peleus.

The whole passage deserves a long commentary⁴¹, but for the purposes of my inquiry it is sufficient to focus on a few points.

It is while Zeus repeatedly bestows shining might (*kydos*)⁴² that Hector turns out to behave as a raging furious fighter⁴³ in the guise of Ares. The text hyperbolizes

Higbie 1990. Here the split formula πῦρ / ἐμβάλοι ἀκάματον has indeed force: «Homer sought grandeur by using both the paired formulas for fire.» Janko 1991, 293.

⁴⁰ «The simile ... means that Ares rages in the mountains and the fire is personified; the fusion of the war-god and fire is apt amid the roar of the narrative.» Janko 1991, 294.

⁴¹ See for instance Jaillard 2007, 97-9.

⁴² «So may Hector appear “shining all about with fire” (O.623), or “shining bright in the armor of the great-hearted son of Peleus” he may show or shine forth for himself (*indalleto*) to all. This is the very armor Zeus has made fit his body in order that the hero may “reflect” the might of Ares (P.210-4).» Prier 1989, 53 f. Indeed we have here almost the figure of Ares himself. For Hector being the fury of fire, under the effect of *kydos*, see P.565 f. where the expression Ἔκτορι πυρὸς αἰνὸν ἔχει μένος repeats, without αἰνὸν, that for the Chimaera in Z.182.

⁴³ Already in the eighth book Athena had described Hector as a raging fighter: (Θ.354-6): οἳ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὄλωνται / ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ῥιπῆ, ὃ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς / Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης, καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε. «[...] who [the Achaeans] would die filling out their fates under a single man's assault, a man who raves beyond all measure, Hector, son of Priam, who has done already many evil deeds.» The feature that in this description assimilates Hector with Ares is the 'raving' (μαίνεται), the 'going berserk', the fury, that is also defined on other occasions as *lyssa* (etymologically the 'she-wolf rage').

this fury by describing its demented features: foam from the mouth⁴⁴, flames from the eyes⁴⁵ – again a form of visibility and conspicuousness –, and shaggy brows at 607 f. We might say that we have here an epiphany of the god in the body of Hector, as the Scholiast suggests: καὶ οὐ μέγχι τούτου τὴν εἰκόνα ἴστησιν (bT 605).

The supernatural might Zeus allows Hector to exhibit and wield, assumes the figure and the nature of Ares' raging and fury.

Among the gods only Ares is described as 'furious' (*mainomenon*, *mainetai* etc) in battle: E.712, 831, O.128, 605 f.; and among the heroes only Hector's fury (*mainesthai*) deserves multiple mentions⁴⁶ and is consistently assimilated to that of Ares.

But here the consubstantiation of Ares with Hector is not the only hint to the audience that, while Zeus bestows on Hector splendid warlike might, his death is to come very soon: the text becomes explicit (O.612-4):

«Zeus was honoring and bestowing on Hector splendid might. For he was to be short of life, yes, and already Pallas Athena was speeding against him the fatal day at the hands of the son of Peleus.»

R. Janko writes: «The foreshadowing of Hector's death is typical and effective. A warrior's short life is a standard pathetic motif»⁴⁷. He quotes the passages where this foreshadowing occurs for Achilles, Hector and two minor Trojan heroes. Yet one should mention that there is a vast difference in the treatment of this motif – if it is the same motif – between the two main heroes. Achilles is represented as being aware that, if he remains at Troy, he will die there and, if he takes revenge on Hector, his death will immediately follow. Accordingly his choice (*proairesis*) to remain and to kill Hector is made with the bitter and grievous consciousness of its high price. The pathos swells his bitter words (e.g. Φ.83 ff.), reaches a painful sublime coldness in his announcement to his mother: «You will not welcome your son returning home ...» (Σ.90) as if he were speaking of another person and not as a son to his mother.

Achilles' s lucid awareness that his choice implies his immediate death marks the existential shape of his heroism. The text plays often on this pathetic awareness, inducing of course the audience's and readers' pathetic response.

On the other hand, Hector sees his life so interconnected with Troy that he imagines his death only with the defeat of Troy (Z.447 ff.); otherwise he is steadily represented without any premonition of his death. The narrative's foretellings of his death (O.612-4, Π.799 ff., etc.) are made outside his awareness, so to speak, behind his back, just as in the passage on which we are commenting. The text therefore exposes

⁴⁴ «The foam at Hector mouth resembles 20.168 (a lion), or *Aspis* 389 f. (a boar with blazing eyes)» Janko 1991, 294.

⁴⁵ See note 32. Prier 1989, 53 sees a transference of light from the eyes to the weaponry and in reverse.

⁴⁶ See Θ.347 ff., 355, 360; I.236, O.605 f., Φ.5; possessed by *lyssa*: Θ.299, I.239, 305, N.305. Occasionally other heroes are described in analogous ways: Patroclus in Π.245 (in connection with *kydos*); Diomedes in E.185 (with the help of a god, Athena); Z.101, Θ.111, Π.75; Achilles in Φ.542 (possessed by *lyssa*), Ω.114=135. In none of these cases is Ares the helping god.

⁴⁷ Janko 1991, 295.

him as being blind to his failures and his fatal destiny just at the moment in which the narrative presents him as being blessed by Zeus' splendid favor; worse, the narrative depicts him as being proudly conscious of this divine favor (for instance Θ.175 f.), so as to exhibit him as foolishly misreading his own destiny, and falling into the deepest deception.

The pathos/pity the text raises for Hector does not emerge from the symbolical or explicit intimation of his near death, but from the exposure of his blindness.

And yet how could he not be blind, when the narrative describes such salient aspects of Zeus' presence and assistance⁴⁸?

It seems that the Narrator chooses just the epic device that connects Hector with divine might in order to contest or qualify that might, leaving Zeus and the hero unaware of his rhetorical trickery⁴⁹.

As we have seen (note 30) the assimilation of Ares with some heroes occurs frequently. Gregory Nagy shows that even the assimilation of Achilles and Patroclus with Ares symbolically conjures up their deaths⁵⁰.

Yet for none of these characters there is so insistent and repeated assimilation with Ares as for Hector. Achilles is assimilated to Ares only twice (Y.45 s. and

⁴⁸ Zeus decides to grant Hector *kydos* (ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι, 596), and to be, directly from heaven – Zeus' habitual place – (αὐτὸς γὰρ οἱ ἅπ' αἰθέρος, 610) his ally. The god drives him against the ships – notice the plural –: (νήεσσιν ἐπι γλαφυρῆσιν ἐγειρεν, 603); yet, while Hector hopes to burn all the Achaean ships – on his *menos* see Jaillard 2007, 87 –, Zeus intends him to burn only one. Hector however does not know Zeus' limited goal. Under Zeus' alliance and assistance, Hector is described filled with a divine fury, that of Ares indeed: («he was raging just as when spear-brandishing Ares or destructive fire rages in the hills», 605); Zeus and Hector do not know that the diegesis assimilates Hector's rage with Ares' and with a blaze in the middle of mountains. A sort of dispossession empties Hector's self-identity during the enactment of his war-like fury. No wonder Hector fails to notice the signs which contradict or deny his total success.

⁴⁹ The diegesis explains that Zeus is driven to give Hector partial victory in order to satisfy his promise to Thetis and that, after a first ship would be touched by the flames, he would give back the *kydos* to the Danaans (O.598-602), Zeus is shown to manipulate Hector and to take advantage of his *menos* and desire, but he does not give him adulterated, diluted *kydos*. He gives him that *kydos* that will bring Hector to reach a limited success: Zeus might then have given *kydos* to the Achaeans, but Patroclus' intervention changes the preceding coordinates of the plot. As Hector kills Patroclus, Zeus gives him to bear on his head Achilles' helmet, «as (δέ) death was close to him» (Π.799 f.). The text seems to suggest that what Zeus may deem to be the scandalous appropriation by Hector is accepted by Zeus as he knows that it will be for a very short time. This same recognition of Hector's short life allows Zeus to grant him great might in P.201-8, as a recompense for his return to Andromache without the arms of Achilles, by which he means dead and naked. See Bakker 1997, 74: correctly, without any implication of pathos: «Hector's death is foreshadowed at the moment of his greatest glory».

⁵⁰ Nagy 1979, 293 f.: «In the Death Scene of Patroklos, the climatic moment is also the context of a more specific epithet: he is described as *thoos atalantos Arei* "equal to swift Ares" (XVI 784).» [...] In *Iliad* XI «we find Patroklos leaving the tent of Achilles and coming out of seclusion; he is described at that very moment as *isos Arei* "equal to Ares" (XI 604). In the very same verse, the narrative itself takes note that the application of this epithet marks Patroklos for death: ἐκμολεν ἴσος Ἄρηϊ, κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή "He came out, equal to Ares, and that was the beginning of his doom."».

X.132), Patroclus only once (Λ.603 s.), while a hero like Diomedes, never. Let us add that Hector and Ares exclusively partake the same epithet *obrimos*: E.845, N.444, 521, Π.613, P.529, O.112 (for Ares), Θ.473, K.200, Λ.347, Ξ.44 (for Hector).

Moreover, neither in the case of Patroclus nor in that of Achilles, does the figure of Ares appear, as in the case of Hector, just in the god-given light of his *kydos*⁵¹ or of *kratos*. In the treatment of Hector therefore we detect a special and specific paradox: the splendor of *kydos* is simultaneously darkened by the sad shadow of this god⁵².

The symbolic negativity of Ares is not limited to the features we have mentioned: Ares, in the *Iliad*, does not simply designate the figure of a defeated god; more seriously he is represented with a problematic closeness to death, as if he might experience something like men's mortality. In E.385 ff. he is imprisoned in a bronze vessel for thirteen months:

καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο,
εἰ μὴ [...]

and then Ares insatiate of battle would have perished here, had not [...] (E.388 s.)

This odd alternative for a god arises again on E.884-7 when he describes his own troubles:

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο δαίμωνι ἴσος·
ἀλλά μ' ὑπήνεικαν ταχέες πόδες ἢ τέ κε δηρὸν 885
αὐτοῦ πῆματ' ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῆσιν νεκάδεσσι,
ἦ κε ζῶς ἀμενηνὸς ἕα χαλκοῖο τυπῆσι.

[Diomedes] then rushed against me, equal to a *daimon*⁵³; my swift feet, however, brought me away; otherwise I would have suffered long anguish among miserable

⁵¹ In Υ.490 ff. Achilles is possessed by a fury and madness that recall that of Ares, but there is no mention of Ares, and no granting of *kydos* by a god, only Achilles' desire to gain *kydos* (502).

⁵² The same textual perversion operates in the use of *φαίδιμος* Ἔκτωρ ('brilliant Hector') in accordance with the analysis of Sachs 1987. As the Author shows, this epithet occurs when Hector is described in the process of retreating, or he envisions a victory he is not getting (H.90), or in a phase of self-delusion. Even the last occurrence of this epithet in X.274 characterizes Hector in his self-delusion: «His words could not be more mistaken. Achilles has indeed learned of Hector's fate from the gods, But just as Hector cannot focus on the image of Athena, neither can he accept his own imminent destruction. Even in book 22, he thus remains deluded, remains – true to the evidence *φαίδιμος* Ἔκτωρ.» (151).

⁵³ Louden 2006, 26, analyses the 9 examples of *δαίμωνι ἴσος* in the *Iliad*: all the occurrences happen to be in Achaean *aristeiai*: of Diomedes (E.438, 459, 884), of Patroclus (Π.705, 786), and Achilles (Υ.447, 493, Φ.18, 227). Eight of these 9 examples occur when the respective best of the Achaeans attempt to attack Trojan-partisan deities (Apollo, Ares, and Xanthos): the exception is Υ.493. Louden 2006, 293 disagrees with Muellner that this expression means 'equal to Ares': «the narrative pattern identifies the best of the Achaeans with victorious pro-Achaeans deities of whom Athena is the most important.» Seeing how Ares conjures up defeat and death it is improbable

heaps of dead, or I would have been, though alive, as a breathless ghost, beaten by the spear.

Ares himself repeats this unthinkable alternative in O.115-8, while in Φ.400 ff. he is struck by a rock hurled by Athena and he lies on the ground, his limbs being unstrung: there is no word on his return to his senses.

The violence of Ares, his war-like madness, vain impetuosity (like a windy storm Υ.51), constant defeat, and closeness to death make of him a sad and ominous figure when he appears in the light of Hector's *kydos*.

For this figure crosses Hector's *kydos* on another important occasion Λ.292-300:

ὥς δ' ὅτε πού τις θηρητῆρ κύνας ἀργιόδοντας
 σεύη ἐπ' ἀγροτέρῳ συὶ καπρίῳ ἢ ἐλέοντι,
 ὥς ἐπ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν σεύε Τρῶας μεγαθύμους
 Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης βροτολοιοῖ ἴσος Ἄρηϊ. 295
 αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,
 ἐν δ' ἔπεισ' ὑσμίνῃ ὑπεραεὶ ἴσος ἀέλλῃ,
 ἢ τε καθαλλομένη ἰοειδέα πόντον ὀρίνει.
 Ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξεν
 Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν;

Just as when some hunter lets lose his white toothed dogs at a wild boar, or a lion, so Hector, son of Priam, drove the great-hearted Trojans at the Achaeans, Hector, equal to murderous Ares. He had moved into the first lines⁵⁴, longing for great deeds⁵⁵, and down he hurled on the battle equal to an impetuous blast that leaps down and stirs the violet sea⁵⁶. Then whom did Hector⁵⁷ kill first, whom last⁵⁸, when Zeus gave him *kydos*?

that the *daimon* in this expression δαίμονι ἴσος – unique index of the best of the Achaeans – refers to him.

⁵⁴ This and the next expressions denote that Hector is initiating his *aristeia*.

⁵⁵ μέγα φρονέων: «this expression always denotes warriors advancing with an aggressive attitude, and so usually occurs in the middle of a battle, and almost always before, after, or during a simile.» (Kelly 2007, 369 f.) In fact a new simile for Hector follows on 305 ff. It is incredible that this whole expression μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει with its accompanying similes is used only here for Hector and in X.21 in Achilles' *aristeia* against Hector. Another affinity between the two passages is the verb σευῶ, -μαι, used in Λ.293 in the simile, representing the hunter-Hector «letting loose his dogs at the beasts», and X.22 Achilles «rushing like a horse» (and see X.26).

⁵⁶ ἰοειδέα: this epithet is hapax in the *Iliad*; 2x in the *Odyssey*, 2x in Hesiod's *Theogony*. The ancients are hesitant on the precise shade evoked by this word: violet, or dark. The sea in this and other Iliadic similes is presented through violent images that are consonant with the battled plain of Troy, see for instance Δ.422 ff.

⁵⁷ The enjambement in 299 f. puts Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης in an emphatic position and not simply in a certain redundancy. The enjambement is the procedure that breaks the syntactic flow of the discourse to the extent that the self-contained unity of the verse is preserved: this tension between syntactic flow and rhythmic unity shows that the quintessential nature of poetry is a discourse in verses.

⁵⁸ On this motif, see the original analysis by Bouvier 1997, 90 f.

tor seems to be aware that the frequent bestowals of splendid power on Hector by Zeus were giving him an exaggerated heroic preeminence and a consistent, steady sublime stance. These effects had to be qualified and contextualized for the audience. The Narrator slyly communicates to the audience that the ‘splendid might’, the ‘splendor of victory’ Zeus grants to Hector do not prevent Hector from being only very partially successful. His relative efficacy explains why it takes so long time, and such repeated efforts for Hector to achieve the burning of even just one ship. The image of Ares ensures also that notwithstanding the beneficial nature of Zeus’ signs, the audience may keep always present in their mind the ultimate defeat and death of the hero, his belonging both to the semi divine race of heroes, and simultaneously to the defeated victims of a lost war.

As we have indicated, this is not all. Hector unfortunately misreads Zeus’ true intentions. The Narrator does not miss any occasion to show how deluded Hector is by the assurance he receives from Zeus’ repeated help. The hero consequently appears foolish and self conceited, even beyond his natural blindness, folly, and arrogance⁶¹.

Whether a certain anti-Trojan animus inspires this strategy deserves consideration, but this point cannot be resolved here, only on the ground of this limited spectrum of contexts.

Given this textual propensity it will not surprise us that the Narrator intensifies or widens the range of his game through different rhetorical means.

In O.637-44, for instance, the text seems to me openly ironic when it magnifies Hector’ s *kydos* while making his deed ridiculously unheroic. In the continuation of the description of Hector’s *kydos*, and going berserk like Ares (605) that we have analyzed (596-612), the text follows with a new simile, itself incongruous, since it makes Hector like a flashing fire and rushing like a wave against a ship (623-9), At this point he is assimilated to a murderous lion, who charges cattle, flocks of thousand of cattle: under the lion’s charge they stampede away. The simile is applied to Hector and the Achaeans. Now of all the crowds of men routed by Hector and father Zeus together (637 θεσπεσίως ἐφόβηθεν ὑφ’ Ἐκτορι καὶ Διὶ πατρὶ⁶²) Hector killed one, Periphetes

⁶¹ See for instance Σ.293 s. where Hector assails the legitimate prophecies of Polydamas just on the ground of his belief – and partial experience – that Zeus is granting him the splendid power of being able to destroy the ships of the Achaeans: νῦν δ’ ὅτε πέρ μοι ἔδωκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω / κῦδος ἀρέσθ’ ἐπὶ νηυσί, θαλάσση τ’ ἔλσαι Ἀχαιούς, « But now that the son of the crooked Kronos has given me to win splendid victory at the ships and to pin the Achaeans against the sea...» The diegesis hastens to comment: «Foolish! Athena had bereft the Trojans of their wit» (311). It is difficult to say whether with Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω the diegesis suggests to the audience the trickery of Zeus. It is also difficult to be certain whether when Zeus asserts Hector’s short life as in Π.799 s., P.201-8 he expresses some pity for him, as certainly he does in another context, see X.168 ff. In 293 s. notice νῦν which emphasizes the temporary dominance provided by *kydos* (*Lfgre*); and even the limitation of the space (ἐπὶ νηυσί).

⁶² θεσπεσίως, a hapax, makes explicit the divine force that routs the Achaeans, while the end of the line evokes, by indirection, the paternal care of Zeus. The irony could not be more glaring. Compare in contrast the participation of Apollo in Hector’s *kydos* (O.320-7): «But when Apollo looked face to face on the Danaans [...] and shook the aegis and himself hurled an enormous bat-

of Mycene: «who then gave Hector greater prestige (*kydos*)» (ὅς ῥα τόθ' Ἐκτορι κῦδος ὑπέριτερον ἐγγυάλιξε, 644⁶³), for in running away his shield-rim tripped him, he stumbled over it, fell, the helmet clattered and Hector, alert, staked the spear in his chest.

If it were not for the death of poor Periphetes, one is induced to smile at the pomposness that celebrates such a nothingness of heroism and at Zeus's collaboration, with his immense power (*kydos* comprehended), in the same nothingness⁶⁴.

We should clearly distinguish the Narrator's manipulation of the epic device to serve his own narrative purposes from the occasional fraudulent use of *kydos* by a god to lure and trap a mortal. This is for instance the trick played by Athena to lure Pandaros⁶⁵.

But when the text exhibits *kydos* simply in order to aggrandize the stature of the hero, though the god accomplishes alone the main part of the deed, we are uncertain how to understand *kydos*. We have seen how Athena and Achilles collaborate in getting the *kydos* of killing Hector: a more abstract or figural function of *kydos* is described by Thetis as she recounts to Hephaistos how Patroclos was killed (Σ.453-6):

All day long they fought around the Scaean gates and that same day they [the Achaeans] would have sacked the town, had not Apollo killed Menoitios' valiant son who had wrought much harm, in the forefront of the battle and given splendid prestige (*kydos*) to Hector.

The actual concrete divine favor, the bestowal of splendid might turns out here to be

tle-cry, he paralyzed (*ethelxe*) their hearts in their breasts and they forgot their impetuous valor, and as when two wild beasts (*there duo*) drive in confusion a herd of cattle or a big flock of sheep, suddenly pouncing down during the darkness of the night, when the herdsman is not by, so were the defenseless Achaeans terror-stricken (*ephobethen*): for Apollo sent a panic (*phobon*) among them, and gave Hector and the Trojans splendid might (*kydos*).» A long series of Achaeans killed by Hector, Aeneas, and Polydamas follows, and the chance of burning the ships emerges: Apollo gives Hector *kydos* by doing the job himself: if we wonder about the detail of the night in the simile, we realize that Apollo of course fights during the day; he shakes the aegis gazing in the faces of the Achaeans (320); the visibility or perceptibility of *kydos* is sufficiently provided by Apollo's aegis, by his enormous battle-cry (320-2) and by his *thelgein* of the Achaeans: all these features constitute the accoutrements of *kydos*. For the miraculous help called *kydos*, see many other passages, as O.458 ff., 491-3, etc. This exceptional sort of help connected with *kydos* sometimes seems to hide the human contribution to the splendor of might (see for instance Σ.455 s.).

⁶³ Here we find an example of the locution whereby the victim by being defeated by the splendid might conferred by god, becomes, through a synecdoche, the giver of *kydos* to the winner. Zeus is indeed the one who gives Hector greater *kydos*.

⁶⁴ Janko 1991, writes «it is no credit to Hector that he kills his victim only because the latter trips up».

⁶⁵ In Δ.93 ff., «Athéna incite Pandare à un acte audacieux, décocher une flèche à Ménélas, ainsi dit-elle "tu emporteras le *kydos* pour les Troyens". La suggestion illusoire de la déesse leurre un moment Pandare qui rompt le trêve, mais se voit frustré de la victoire; il ne parvient qu' à blesser Ménélas.» (Jaillard 2007, 87).

an icon, an emblem of victory⁶⁶. During the description of the final phase of the confrontation between Patroclus and Hector, no *kydos* is handed to Hector⁶⁷: his killing act is defined by Patroclus as the third in a series of different agents, Apollo, Euphorbus and Hector (Π.849 s.): it is only now, from the words of Thetis, that Hector's killing of Patroclus is aggrandized⁶⁸. For, of course, it is a sign of grandeur for the hero to have access to the collaboration with Apollo. And yet it is not absolutely clear that Thetis mentions this *kydos* as a compliment for Hector: here *kydos* means simply 'the flag of victory'.

With this last example we have analyzed the most salient instances in which Hector is bestowed with *kydos*. We have seen that the hands of Zeus pushing Hector to the immediate enactment of splendid might do not protect him from the ominous intimations the narrative suggests by associating him to Ares, by sly ironies and other questionable purposes. Only after Hector's death, the Narrator slackens and ceases qualifying and corroding the splendid might of the hero. In the praising words of his mother Hecabe, *kydos* appears as Hector's permanent predicate (X.432-5):

[...] ὁ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέρας
εὐχολὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκειο, πᾶσι τ' ὄνειρα
Τρωσὶ τε καὶ Τρωῆσι κατὰ πτόλιν, οἷ σε θεὸν ὧς
δειδέχατ'· ἧ γὰρ καὶ σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα
ζωὸς ἐόν· νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κίχάνει.

[...] Night and day⁶⁹, you were my pride in the city, the blessing to men and women of Troy who acclaimed you like a god. For them you were their greatest splendor (or might, majesty, magnificence ["Prunkstück", Führer]) while you lived – now death and fate have seized you.

The text makes clear that Hector's magnificence was visible, perceivable and effective while he was living, but also that it was Hector's permanent, indelible attribute. A halo of might and majesty marked him all the time in the eyes of the Trojans,

⁶⁶ As Nagy 1979, 76, translates *kydos* in this passage: «emblem of victory».

⁶⁷ Apollo, disguised as Asius, tries to lure Hector, who is withdrawing from the battle, by giving him hope that Apollo may grant him *kydos* (P.725). A few lines later (730) Apollo is said to cause havoc among the Argives and to hand *kydos* both to the Trojans and Hector; and yet, as the battle around the body of Kebriones takes place, Patroclus and the Achaeans have the upper hand (780), true to Hector's ominous association with Ares.

⁶⁸ Of course, Achilles sees Hector as the real responsible party for the death of Patroclus: «those whom Hector son of Priam has killed and Zeus has given him *kydos*» (T.203 s.). Zeus too in O.65 and P.204 attributes Patroclus' death to Hector. In this last passage Zeus comments on Hector's killing of Achilles' friend, his wearing Achilles' weapons and foresees Hector's death. Xanthos, on the contrary, reckons the situation with the same words as Thetis (T.413 s.). Those who speak as Thetis and Xanthos do mean to reduce Hector's prowess and to make Patroclus truly the victim of a god, not of a mere mortal.

⁶⁹ On line X.432 the ending *νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέρας* is found in E.490 where Sarpedon tells Hector «all these cares should rest on you by night and day». The expression of course means 'all the time', but mentioning the two opposite parts of the day produces a rhetorically stronger temporal dimension.

males and females. This halo disappears at his death, but as it becomes a mark of his being, it turns out to be part of his *kleos* (reputation, glory)⁷⁰. In this way the epic *kleos* carries around and everywhere the luminous image of Hector. The word opens itself to a light, a vision.

This passage suggests that Hector's splendid might and majesty (*kydos*) is the completion and the essence of the various attributes that characterize his heroic figure: the εὐχολή ('boast and glory'), the ὄνειδος (his being a great boon, a blessing) and especially «his being acclaimed and saluted like a god»⁷¹. Even accounting for the hyperbolic metaphor of this expression, so common in the Epos, it ought at least to suggest that in the eyes of the Trojans a sort of 'aura', or 'halo' marks Hector's person as they see him coming to them, moving among them, and fighting for them⁷².

It is this divine look, halo, aura that invites us to recognize something luminous, majestic in the *kydos* that Hector is for the Trojans (σφι)⁷³.

The way the Trojans acclaim and salute Hector like a god, implies an intense exchange of glances, and specifically of glances that are reverent, admiring, devoted. M. Detienne has written: «Voir et être vu sont une seule et même expérience religieuse dans la quelle se constitue l'univers formel», and Bruno Cany, who quotes this passage, comments, as we have seen (note 12), by saying that the luminous being is «le héros comme idéalisation de l'homme et comme miroir du divin», and intimating the problematic nature of these identifications (pp. 181-3.).

Even the expression «be acclaimed as a god» is problematic. What does it exactly imply? Even if we exclude literary hyperbole, and accept its religious evocation, what still remains uncertain is the latitude of that similarity and of the religious experience that it conjures up⁷⁴. Another question is which god is thought to be the model: divine being in general or a specific god? Certainly not Ares, I think.

⁷⁰ In this passage, *kydos* manifests its difference from 'glory' since 'εὐχολή' already suggests that meaning. Benveniste 1969, 66 understood this *kydos* as «talisman of victory».

⁷¹ The connection between the blessed condition of being possessed by *kydos* and that of being similar to the gods is made by Agamemnon in reference to the Trojans in *Iliad* Ε.72 s., where he says: «[...] and now I know that he [Zeus] gives the Trojans *kydos* (magnificent victory, splendor, etc.) like to gods, and has bound our fury and hands.» οἶδα δὲ νῦν ὅτε τοὺς μὲν ὁμῶς μακάρεσσιν θεοῖσιν / κυδάνει, ἡμέτερον δὲ μένος καὶ χεῖρας ἔδησεν. This passage is important also because it is one of the examples that contrasts the possession of *kydos* with a sort of paralysis that would affect the enemy party. Agamemnon becomes aware of, or believes he has noticed, an objective exaltation in the enemy army and a degradation of his own army's powers, as effects of *kydos*.

⁷² A scene in which spouses and daughters of the Trojan fighters run around Hector to ask for news is depicted in Z.237 ff., but the text does not underline any mark of veneration for him. We must reckon with the fact that Hecabe's words are part of her praise for the dead Hector: she asserts his *kydos* as his predicate, attributing him a quality that is always granted by a divine source. This exceptional use of *kydos* is striking and reminds us of the locutions for Nestor and Odysseus as «great *kydos* of the Achaeans».

⁷³ It is not unproblematic to interpret this dative: majesty, magnificence for them, i.e. in their eyes, or among them or expanding and radiating upon them.

⁷⁴ On the question of the extent to which the gods in the *Iliad* serve also as textual devices of the narration see Pucci 1997, 230, and Pucci 2002, 17-34.

The text refer to crowds acclaiming and saluting Hector as a god⁷⁵: examples of a devoted crowd welcoming a god are missing in the *Iliad* and the closest context is afforded by the text on Z.272 ff. where the Trojan women pray to the statue of Athena. On lines 303 ff. the goddess, not the statue, is described as having beautiful hair, but no shine – no aura or halo – is mentioned. The women pray to Athena – who is thought to be in the statue – with great devotion: «They all lifted their hands to Athena with a holy cry» (αἶ δ' ὀλολυγῆ πᾶσαι Ἀθήνη χειρᾶς ἀνέσχον) ... and Athena's priestess «begged her and prayed the daughter of great Zeus» beginning with a full noun-epithet verse: «Queen Athena saviour of the city, divine among the goddesses» ... (εὐχομένη δ' ἤρᾳτο Διὸς κόουρη μέγᾳλοιο / πότνι Ἀθηναίη ἐρυσίπτολι δῖα θεάων, Z.301-5).

This is the closest example that we have in the *Iliad* of a group of person praying to and acclaiming a god.

Finally Hector reaches the oral tradition and fame (*kleos*) as a luminous, magnificent image: *kydos* makes him shining, conspicuous, possessed by a divine force. But this happens only after his death; and it happens here while in many other instances of *kydos* its victorious magnificence has been corroded by an ominous image. In Hecabe's celebration it is thinkable that the God who has granted him this privilege and magnificence has been Zeus.

In this way, the emergence of Hector's *kydos*, in its full manifestation, contributes to inject into the poem the aura of numinous presence, of light, and of divine suspension of the present time. These are indeed, as we have seen, the effects that so often characterize this divine blessing.

In the same way as divine epiphanies (see Athena, for instance, in the first book) put heroes in contact with gods, so the bestowal of *kydos* on the few selected heroes brings the god close to man and occasionally subtracts the action from its narrative flow, and suspends it in a different register of temporality and space.

Many examples of *kydos* enlarge the luminous surface of the Iliadic narrative. Many epic devices conspire to produce this effect: several similes compare the main heroes to the stars and to the fire; many representations of the shining weapons, gleaming sometimes with reflections from the stars (e.g. B.579, E.3-6, Z.319, Λ.61-6, N.340-4, M.463 s., O.209 ff., 613, Π.70 s., Σ.510, T.359-80, Υ.156, X.32, 135 s., etc.), etc. *Kydos* contributes to enlarging this constellation of luminosity: it puts the heroes and their deeds in a visible halo. It is this visibility that makes them recognizable as heroes and makes them terrifying in the eyes of their enemies. In general, even independently from *kydos*, it is the sight of the heroes' deeds that causes praise and reputation: see, for instance M.315 ff., where Sarpedon theorizes that as the Lycians see their leaders fighting in the first ranks they realize that they are «not without glory» (*akleos*).

The radiating power of *kydos* invites the readers and the audience to realize that the poetic word that carries around the *klea* of the heroes, constantly reports a brightness that makes the deeds visible, conspicuous and blessed by divine help. Of

⁷⁵ The verb δειδέχαιτ' is connected with δέχομαι (*LSJ*).

course it is the word that creates the light and the divine halo, and not the reverse, but the word needs to take the posture of witnessing that light and halo in order to become a glorious and inextinguishable poem.

Dept. of Classics, Cornell University
Ithaca, NY, Usa.

Pietro Pucci

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Ameis – Hentze 1930

K.F. Ameis – K. Hentze, *Homers Ilias*, Leipzig-Berlin 1930⁵.

Bakker 1988

E. Bakker, *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1988.

Bakker 1997

E. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech*, Ithaca 1997.

Benveniste 1969

E. Benveniste, *Vocabulaire des Institutions Indoeuropéennes*, II, Paris 1969, 57-69.

Bergson 1956

L. Bergson, *L'épithète ornementale dans Euripide, Sophocle et Eschyle*, Lund 1956.

Bouvier 1997

D. Bouvier, *Mémoire et répétition dans la poésie homérique*, in F. Létoublon (ed.), *Homage à Milman Parry. Le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique*, Amsterdam 1997, 79-92.

Cany 2001

Bruno Cany, *Homère. Une anthropologie poétique de la vérité*, Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq. 2001.

Dettori 1988-89

E. Dettori, *Pind. 'I.' I 11*, MCr 23-24, 1988-89, 59-93.

Fränkel 1973

H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, Oxford 1973.

Higbie 1990

C. Higbie, *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities*, New York-London 1990.

Higbie 1990

C. Higbie, *Measure and Music, Enjambement and Sentence Structure in the 'Iliad'*, Oxford 1990.

Jaillard 2007

D. Jaillard, 'Kûdos aresthai' (emporter le 'kûdos'): le 'kûdos' des rois, des guerriers et des athlètes au miroir des dieux, *Gaia* 11, 2007, 85-99.

Janko 1991

R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. IV, Cambridge 1991.

Jørgensen 1904

O. Jørgensen, *Das Auftreten der Götter in den Büchern ι-μ der Odyssee*, *Hermes* 39, 1904, 357-82.

Kelly 2007

Kelly, *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, 'Iliad' VIII*, Oxford 2007.

Latacz 1966

J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld Freude in der Sprache Homers*, Heidelberg 1966.

Leaf 1902

W. Leaf, *The Iliad. Edited with Apparatus Criticus, Prolegomena, Notes and Appendices*, II, London 1902².

Louden 2006

B. Louden, *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning*, Baltimore 2006.

Nagy 1979

G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*, Baltimore-London 1979.

Piettre 1996

Renée Piettre, *Le corps des dieux dans les épiphanies divines en Grèce ancienne*, Thèse de Doctorat, Paris 1996.

Prier 1989

M.A. Prier, *Thauma Idesthai*, Tallahassee 1989.

Pucci 1997

P. Pucci, *The Song of the Sirens*, Lanham-Boulder-New York-London 1997.

Pucci 2002

P. Pucci, *Theology and Poetic in the 'Iliad'*, *Arethusa* 35, 2002, 17-34.

Richardson 1993

N. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. VI, Cambridge 1993.

Sachs 1987

R. Sachs, *The Traditional Phrase in Homer*, Leiden 1987.

The Splendid Figure of Κῦδος

Abstract. Recent interpreters (Jaillard, Latacz etc.) have recognized, on the wake of Benveniste, the semantic valor of *kydos* in the Iliad as ‘splendid might, triumph, magnificence’. Accepting this meaning, the Author analyses how this epic expression frames in different ways the few heroes to which the gods attribute this visible blessing. Among them, Hector constitutes a paradoxical case, since, while he is the hero most often blessed by Zeus’ direct attribution of *kydos*, he is simultaneously, in the same passages, identified with Ares, an identification that connotes the ineffectiveness, even the defeat and death of the characters so compared. The Author explains the narrative and ideological reasons for this paradox. The paper ends by showing that the splendor of *kydos* adds permanent shining to the deeds of the Iliadic heroes.

Keywords. Splendid might, heroic paradox, permanent shine.