

# Trojan Politics and the Assemblies of *Iliad* 7

*Joel P. Christensen*

THE POLITICAL CHARACTER of the *Iliad* has been illuminated by recent scholarship.<sup>1</sup> Despite the largely Achaean emphasis of the poem, scholars have also noted the interpretive importance of the contrast and com-

<sup>1</sup> On politics see W. Nicolai, "Rezeptionssteuerung in der *Ilias*," *Philologus* 127 (1983) 1–27; W. Donlan "The Structure of Authority in the *Iliad*," *Arethusa* 12 (1979) 51–70, and "The Relations of Power in the Pre-State and Early State Politics," in L. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London 1997) 39–48; W. M. Sale, "The Government of Troy: Politics in the *Iliad*," *GRBS* 35 (1994) 5–102; D. Hammer, "Who Shall Readily Obey?" Authority and Politics in the *Iliad*," *Phoenix* 51 (1997) 1–24, "The Politics of the *Iliad*," *CJ* (1998) 1–30, and *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought* (Norman 2002); D. F. Wilson, *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad* (Cambridge 2002); E. T. E. Barker, "Achilles' Last Stand: Institutionalising Dissent in Homer's *Iliad*," *PCPS* 50 (2004) 92–120, and *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy* (Oxford 2009); D. Elmer, *Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the Iliad* (Baltimore 2013). Political themes resonant with the *Iliad* pervade Archaic poetry, e.g. Solon, *Hes. Op.*, Xenoph. fr.2.16–19, and Archil. fr.114.1–4; see E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge 2005). For the Achaean system as plebiscitary politics see Hammer, *The Iliad as Politics* 146–152. For the political conflict as between a fixed system—a static amount of *time* attached to inherited worth—and a fluid one—performed excellence—see Wilson 36–37. Cf. Jonathan M. Hall, "Polis, Community, and Ethnic Identity," in H. A. Shapiro (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece* (Cambridge 2007) 48–49, for Homeric epics privileging "achieved" authority over "ascribed." For the central struggle as one within the ruling class, monarchy vs. an aristocratic oligarchy, see P. W. Rose, "Ideology in the *Iliad*: Polis, *Basileus*, *Theoi*," *Arethusa* 30 (1997) 151–199.

plementarity of other portrayed groups.<sup>2</sup> The Achaeans, gods, and Trojans use similar institutions to confront analogous assumptions about political power.<sup>3</sup> These notional politics represent potential political arrangements for the epic's audiences: the public assembly and the smaller elite council reflected in deliberation scenes echo the institutions shared by many Greek states in the late Archaic age.<sup>4</sup>

Within each political group, language-use is essential in mediating conflicts and mitigating danger. Indeed, these two functions are embodied in the contrast between the language of the assembly—which is, generally, highly rhetorical and replete with poetic devices—and that of the council, which is simpler

<sup>2</sup> On Trojan politics see Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 5–102; H. Mackie, *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad* (Lanham 1996) 21–26; Barker, *Entering the Agon* 68–74; Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 132–145.

<sup>3</sup> For differences in the government and economy of the Trojans and the Achaeans see Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 9. For divine politics see J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus* (London 2006), and Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 145–174. For Olympian political scenes, see Table 2 below.

<sup>4</sup> For the council as a deliberative context see Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 24. Cf. R. Sealey, “Probouleusis and the Sovereign Assembly,” *CSCA* 2 (1969) 247–269, for the Homeric *boule geronton*. For the assembly as a marker of civilization see E. Cook, *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* (Ithaca 1995) 70. For Homer's historical age see V. P. Petrakis, “History versus the Homeric *Iliad*: A View from the Ionian Islands,” *CW* 99 (2006) 371–396; H. van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence, and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam 1992). For the Archaic age as context for the *Iliad*'s political story see Wilson, *Ransom* 11–12. Donlan, *Arethusa* 12 (1979) 51–70, prefers the middle geometric period; cf. Hammer, *The Iliad as Politics* 23. Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 13, argues that “the government and economy of Troy in the *Iliad* reflects the government and economy of an eighth-century polis.” For the Homeric world as the Dark Age see M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (New York 1979); for the Bronze Age, S. Hood, “The Bronze Age Context of Homer,” in J. P. Carter and S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule* (Austin 1998) 25–32. For historical parallels in governments see Sale 91–94. For correlations between represented institutions like the council and Spartan political realities see F. Schulz, *Die homerischen Räte und die spartanische Gerusie* (Berlin 2011), esp. 5–89 for an analysis of Homeric council scenes.

and contains a greater proportion of plans and directives.<sup>5</sup> The assembly is also crucial for community cohesion and for authorizing political and military actions.<sup>6</sup> The epic takes pains to establish assembly practices in Book 1: one speaker presents a problem, another responds, and a third mediates.<sup>7</sup> This pattern recurs among the Achaeans and the gods where we also find frequent alternation between full assembly scenes and more sober small councils.

The epic presents fewer Trojan political meetings. And those

<sup>5</sup> See J. P. Christensen, “The End of Speeches and a Speech’s End: Nestor, Diomedes, and the *telos muthon*,” in K. Myrsiades (ed.), *Reading Homer: Film and Text* (Teaneck 2009) 158 n.49.

<sup>6</sup> For the assembly and communal action see K. A. Raaflaub and R. W. Wallace, “‘People’s Power’ and Egalitarian Trends in Archaic Greece,” in K. A. Raaflaub et al. (eds.), *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 2007) 22–48. Barker, *Entering the Agon*, sees the assembly scenes in the *Iliad* as a process of institutionalization wherein the assembly is being created and explored through the epic itself; cf. D. Hammer, “Homer, Tyranny, and Democracy,” *GRBS* 39 (1998) 334 n.7; E. T. E. Barker and J. P. Christensen, *Homer: A Beginner’s Guide* (London 2013) 85–87. On Homeric assemblies see Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 21–25; for Trojan assemblies cf. Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 66–69. On assembly formation see L. Gernet, “Jeux et droit (Remarques sur le XXIII<sup>e</sup> chant de l’*Iliade*),” *RD SER.* IV 26 (1948) 177–188; J. D. Ellsworth, “ΑΓΩΝ ΝΕΩΝ: An Unrecognized Metaphor in the *Iliad*,” *CP* 69 (1974) 258–264; F. Ruzé, *Délibération et pouvoir dans la cité grecque* (Paris 1997); Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 3–4; Barker, *PCPS* 50 (2004) 92–120, and *Entering the Agon* 17–20 and 34–36. For the assembly as a type-scene see M. W. Edwards, “Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type Scene,” *Oral Tradition* 7 (1992) 311.

<sup>7</sup> For the formulaic arrangement of Homeric assemblies see D. Beck, *Homeric Conversation* (Washington 2005) 191–228. The pattern is anticipated in Hes. *Theog.* where a *basileus* is expected to mediate between men arguing in the *agore* (79–93). Cf. R. P. Martin, “Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes,” *TAPA* 114 (1984) 43; G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*<sup>2</sup> (Baltimore 1999) 311–312; and Christensen, in *Reading Homer* 136–162. For this scene as representing the kernels of Greek rhetoric see J. T. Kirby, “Rhetoric and Poetics in Hesiod,” *Ramus* 21 (1992) 34–50, and J. Walker, “Before the Beginnings of ‘Poetry’ and ‘Rhetoric’: Hesiod on Eloquence,” *Rhetorica* 14 (1996) 243–265.

depicted emphasize deficient features of the city's political institutions (see Tables 1–3 for summaries of the meetings of the three polities).<sup>8</sup> In part, the epic marks Trojan political difference by marginalizing any deliberative council and limiting opportunities for debate.<sup>9</sup> An under-analyzed assembly scene in Book 7 presents a microcosmic view of the limits on advice and deliberation in the Trojan polity.<sup>10</sup> This paper examines how the Trojan assembly in Book 7, its separate proposals, and its re-contextualization in a messenger speech

<sup>8</sup> As Mackie argues, *Talking Trojan* 15–26, Trojan assemblies are more chaotic than their Achaean counterparts: they exhibit fewer speech-exchanges and are characterized by their noise. Cf. Barker, *Entering the Agon* 68–74. For Trojan political gatherings see Table 3. For summary comments on Trojan political character cf. Hammer, *Iliad as Politics* 46–47. Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 144, concludes that Trojan consensus “involves a denial of community rather than an affirmation of it.”

<sup>9</sup> Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994), argues that the *Iliad* presents a weak Trojan king and a council of elders who are the “real rulers” (11); cf. Schulz, *Die homerischen Räte* 15–20. And yet Antenor is the only Trojan advisor who speaks in the *Iliad*. Cf. G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary II* (Cambridge 1990) 283. Homer compares the deliberating advisors to cicadas (3.146–155), neglected like Tithonus. Cf. *Hymn.Hom.Ven.* 218–236. Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 27, argues that Trojan politics suffers for “want of regard for wisdom of the old as well as virtual absence of the *boulé* itself.” As Sale notes (60–62), the Trojan polity is complicated by an alliance of military allies collocated with the civic government of the city. There are thus two councils and two possible assemblies. For a contrary view of a weaker and failing Trojan council see Nicolai, *Philologus* 127 (1983) 10. The marginalization of good advice coalesces around Hektor's engagement with Polydamas. For this pattern exemplified by Polydamas and Hektor see K. Dickson, *Nestor: Poetic Memory in Greek Epic* (New York 1995) 133–143; cf. J. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hektor* (Chicago 1975) 143–153; Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 137–138. In these scenes, Hektor takes Polydamas' advice when it is convenient. For the interaction between Hektor and Polydamas as an indication of the volatility intrinsic to plebiscitary politics see Hammer, *CJ* (1998) 344–345.

<sup>10</sup> For Book 7 as “below the [*Iliad*'s] standard of excellence” with scenes that “are compressed and perfunctory” see M. L. West, *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford 2011) 187.

reveal both the limitations of Trojan politics and the subtlety of the Homeric characterization. In turn, this reading suggests that Trojan marginalization of debate and advice is positioned in part as responsible for the destruction of the city.<sup>11</sup> As a result, the assembly in Book 7 functions as an index of the epic's political questions. This argument, additionally, demands a reconsideration of Book 7 by illustrating its importance to the epic as a whole.

*The assemblies of Book 7*

Book 7 sets out three political scenes in close succession which frame essential differences between the Trojans and the Achaeans. First, in the Achaean *boule*, Nestor calls for fortifications and the burial of the dead (7.323–344). Then, during an assembly held before Priam's home, Antenor stands to speak. While these scenes advance the plot, the juxtaposition of subsidiary themes—who can advise and authorize advice—offers a unique opportunity for examining the *Iliad's* presentation of Trojan politics.

Despite the clear contrast in characterization developed through the assemblies of Book 7, the Trojan assembly scene has suffered from a lack of analysis.<sup>12</sup> A partial cause of this, perhaps, is that this scene echoes the negotiations that preceded the war,<sup>13</sup> when Odysseus and Menelaos sought to

<sup>11</sup> Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 7–9, suggests that a “flaw” in Trojan culture “keeps them from returning Helen and making appropriate restitution.” To Sale, Trojan political and economic structure gives undue influence to a small oligarchic body of elders who take bribes and help to perpetuate the war in their interests. Ultimately, though Sale does not make this clear, such implicit complaints about the Trojan elders would make them guilty of offences similar to those attributed to the kings in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.

<sup>12</sup> On Book 7 see Sale *GRBS* 35 (1994) 76–77; Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 135–137.

<sup>13</sup> For neoanalytical interest in Antenor and his family see W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden 1960) 177–180, and P. Wathelet, “Le mythe d'Enée dans l'épopée homérique,” in Fr. Jouan and A. Motte (eds.), *Mythe et politique* (Paris 1990) 287–296. For Iliadic passages featuring Antenor as

resolve the conflict through diplomacy.<sup>14</sup> The *Iliad* ‘remembers’ this: in Book 3, Antenor mentions that Odysseus and Menelaos stayed in his house (3.205–225).<sup>15</sup> Objection to the Trojan assembly arises from its fit in the Iliadic context: a debate over the return of Helen at this time seems suspect (although the epic justifies it with the broken oath of Book 3). Indeed, the contents of both the Achaean council and the Trojan assembly are analeptic—Nestor’s proposal to build fortifications is also anachronistic for this moment in the war.<sup>16</sup>

Yet what makes both political scenes fit—and even necessary—is the way in which they bring into relief critical political differences between the Achaeans and the Trojans.<sup>17</sup> Where

---

‘late’ see L. Espermann, *Antenor, Theano, Antenoriden: Ihre Person und Bedeutung in der Ilias* (Meisenheim am Glan 1980); cf. West, *Making of the Iliad* 113. For Antenor and his sons in early art see S. Lowenstam, “Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth,” *TAPA* 127 (1997) 29–34.

<sup>14</sup> When the embassy occurred is unclear. The A scholion (*Il.* 3.206a [II 397 Erbse], πρὸ τοῦ στρατεῦσαι: Αντήνωρ ξενίζει φιλοφρόνως) places the event before the military expedition while Apollodorus (3.28–29) sets it after Lemnos.

<sup>15</sup> Antenor describes the speaking styles of Odysseus and Menelaos (3.204–224). His descriptions, however, appear to be wholly aesthetic, cf. Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 38–40. For the diplomacy and Antenor’s role see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore 1993) 594–596; cf. Procl. *Comm. ad Pl. Alc. I* 214.3–6 (II 267 Segonds). In the broader mythical tradition (as the *Iliad* mentions, 11.122–142) a Trojan named Antimachos, bribed by Paris, attempted to persuade the Trojans to murder Menelaos. This scene appears in art (see Paus. 10.27.3; Gantz 595), Bacch. fr.15 (where Antenor’s wife, Theano, plays a role), and Soph. *Helenes Apaitesis* (fr.176 ff.). According to schol. *Il.* 3.205a (II 396), Antenor’s household was spared by Agamemnon during the sack.

<sup>16</sup> The fortifications are a classic bugbear of analysts. See J. I. Porter, “Making and Unmaking: The Achaean Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism,” *TAPA* 141 (2011) 1–36, and West, *Making of the Iliad* 194–195.

<sup>17</sup> West, *Making of the Iliad* 195, suggests that the Trojan assembly is depicted so as to explain a truce long enough for the building of the

the first council scene illustrates the relative functionality of the Achaeans' political institutions, the assembly scene of *Iliad* 7 functions as an index of the obstacles that attend Trojan politics. This process occurs through several steps—first, a useful, if impossible, proposal is made in the assembly and rejected. Next, an authority figure provides an unsatisfying but necessary resolution. Finally, we may sense the tension in the Trojan polity through the speech of the messenger, Idaios, who addresses a full and functional Achaean assembly.

The Greek council (7.323–344) closes with political unity as everyone assents to Nestor's proposal.<sup>18</sup> The Trojan assembly, occurring outside Priam's home (346), corresponds in location to the Greek *boule* (held in Agamemnon's residence, 313). The contrast in institutional location indicates a difference in the power structure.<sup>19</sup> In addition, as a scholiast notes, there is something amiss with the gathering itself: no one seems to have called it and it happens in a “terribly disturbed” fashion (δεινὴ τετρηχυῖα, 346).<sup>20</sup> Trojan political language, as the rest of the

---

fortifications, a problematic structure that, according to West, is a strong indicator of later accretions (54–55).

<sup>18</sup> Elmer, *Poetics of Consent*, examines the poetics of praise/consent (*epainos*) and shows convincingly that the political struggle in the *Iliad* is largely one that contemplates the dynamics and relevance of communal assent. Communal assent is absent or abortive at critical moments in the narrative. Where the Trojans do assent communally (as in Book 18) the outcome is disastrous.

<sup>19</sup> The Achaean assembly, we learn in Book 11, takes place by Odysseus' ship in the middle of the camp, which illustrates its communal function. See Barker, *Entering the Agon* 68; cf. J. S. Clay, *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision and Memory in the Iliad* (Cambridge 2011) 49 and fig. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Kirk, *The Iliad* 280, compares the language of the disorder to the gathering of the Achaean assembly in Book 2, but does not seem to be able to account for the adjective *deine*, which he attributes to metrical need. The scholiast speculates that the people came together because they were agitated: schol. *Il.* bT 7.346b (II 282), τετρηχυῖα: τεταραγμένη, ἢ διὰ τὰ προλεχθέντα ἢ διὰ τὸ “πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν” (4.438) ἢ διὰ τὸ διχογνωμεῖν περὶ Ἑλένης ὡς Ἀντήνωρ καὶ Ἀντίμαχος (7.347–353, 11.123–125). δηλοῖ ὡς οὐχ οἱ βασιλεῖς συνήγαγον αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἀγανακτοῦντες ἦκον εἰς τὰ βασίλεια.

assembly implies, is used to create a false unity and facilitate the maintenance of the status quo rather than resolving a conflict or saving the people.<sup>21</sup> Since this scene echoes arguments prior to the siege, the *Iliad* may through retrospection blame Trojan suffering in general on their use of language in decision making.

Not only does the Trojan assembly point up disruption in the Trojan *agore*, but it also implicitly stresses the absence of Trojan advisors or a functional council. As part of this, the rejection of Antenor, a figure whose characterization parallels Nestor's to an extent, represents the marginalization of debate and deliberation.<sup>22</sup> That Antenor is central to this moment was probably unsurprising. The tradition, as reflected in art, mythography, and the scholia, contrasts Antenor with the royal family in important ways—for example, he is a good host (he houses Odysseus and Nestor and prevents their murders) in contrast to the antisocial behavior of Paris that prompts the war.<sup>23</sup> Just in case, however, the *Iliad* has told his story in Book 3—he is set

---

The chaos may be occasional (the breaking of the oaths and the irregularity of the situation), institutional (because the Trojans have overlapping assemblies with their allies) or typical of the Trojan assembly, as Mackie argues, *Talking Trojan* 16–23. From the first assembly, the Trojans exhibit a disharmony that, according to Mackie, is connected to their linguistic diversity and their weak political traditions.

<sup>21</sup> This scene also anticipates that a *good* leader will use speech to resolve conflicts and forestall or prevent civil violence. See Kirby, *Ramus* 21 (1992) 34–50; H. Roisman, “Nestor the Good Counsellor,” *CQ* 55 (2005) 17–38; and Christensen, in *Reading Homer* 151–153.

<sup>22</sup> Schol. *Il.* 7.345a (III 281–282) draws the parallel between Nestor and Antenor directly: Τρώων αὐτ' ἀγορή: ἔδει γὰρ τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱῶν ἡττωμένων καὶ κινδυνευσάσης τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ Διομήδους, δυσελπίδων ὄντων διὰ τὴν παράβασιν, σκοπεῖν τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι Νέστορ, ἐν δὲ Τρωσὶν Ἀντήνωρ. In Bacchylides' fragmentary *Antenoridai*, Antenor is called εὐβουλος ἦρως (fr. 15.37).

<sup>23</sup> The scholia mark Antenor as god-fearing (schol. *Il.* bT 7.347a [III 282], ὡς πρόξενος Ἑλλήνων καὶ δημηγορῶν καὶ θεοσεβῆς), a description that qualifies men as civilized and law-abiding in the *Odyssey*; see Cook, *The Odyssey in Athens* 100–101.



up as an authority on speech and the assembly when he contrasts the speaking styles of Agamemnon and Odysseus (3.203–224). In Book 7, Antenor stands, unbidden,<sup>24</sup> with only the epithet *πεπνυμένος* as an introduction (7.345–353):<sup>25</sup>

Τρώων αὐτ' ἀγορὴ γένητ' Ἰλίου ἐν πόλει ἄκρη  
 δεινὴ τετρηχυῖα, παρὰ Πριάμοιο θύρησι·  
 τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντήνωρ πεπνυμένος ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν·  
 “κέκλυτέ μευ Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι,  
 ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.  
 δεῦτ' ἄγετ' Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ' ἅμ' αὐτῇ  
 δώομεν Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἄγειν· νῦν δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ  
 ψευσάμενοι μαχόμεσθα· τὸ οὐ νύ τι κέρδιον ἡμῖν  
 ἔλπομαι ἐκτελέεσθαι, ἴνα μὴ ρέξομεν ὄδε.”

Then the Trojan assembly was held on the city peak of Ilium, terribly disordered, alongside the doorways of Priam's home. Among them prudent Antenor began to speak publicly: “Hear me, Trojans, Dardanians, and allies, so that I may speak what the heart in my chest bids me. Come now, let us give Argive Helen and her possessions too

<sup>24</sup> Barker, *Entering the Agon* 68–69, compares Antenor to Achilles in Book 1, a figure who stands up and speaks for the good of the community. Compare Nestor in the council in Book 9.

<sup>25</sup> The adjective *πεπνυμένος* describes Antenor elsewhere (3.148, 208), and other characters only three times in the *Iliad* (13.254, 13.266, 23.586); it may reveal that the speaker knows something more than the addressee, see N. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* (Berkeley 1975) 55–62; D. Beck, “Speech Introductions and the Character Development of Telemachus,” *CJ* 94 (1998/9) 121–141; J. Heath, “Telemachus ΠΕΠΝΥΜΕΝΟΣ: Growing into an Epithet,” *Mnemosyne* 54 (2001) 129–157. Scodel, in part, argues that extended speech-introductions like Antenor's “are especially associated with failed interventions” (R. Scodel, *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* [Ann Arbor 2002] 95); these failures lead the audience to understand a contrast with the ideal presented (or what should happen) and the ‘misfire’ (what does happen). On speech introductions as a feature of oral-composition see M. W. Edwards, “Homeric Speech Introductions,” *HSCP* 74 (1970) 1–36; A. Riggsby, “Homeric Speech Introductions and the Theory of Homeric Composition,” *TAPA* 122 (1992) 98–114.

to the sons of Atreus to take away; now we fight even though we made false the sacred oaths; thus I do not expect that anything advantageous for us will happen unless we do this.”

Antenor makes his proposal with some striking rhetorical choices. Instead of addressing the leaders, he calls to the assembled Trojans and allies and invokes a collective with his choice of verbal person (κέκλυτέ μεν Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἡδ' ἐπίκουροι, δώομεν, μαχόμεσθα, ῥέξομεν).<sup>26</sup> At first glance, he crafts a communal body politic in his call for unified action—yet in appealing to this ‘we’, he proposes an action that implicitly creates an opposition in Paris’ desire (supported, presumably, by the royal family).<sup>27</sup> Where Nestor and Odysseus manipulate direct addresses to recreate and support Achaean unity,<sup>28</sup> Antenor’s address at first obscures but ultimately discloses disunity. In an act that is at once politically astute—he does not attack Paris—but also dangerous (in creating a political will distinct from Priam’s family), Antenor clarifies this danger and gives voice to unspoken dissent. His willingness to take collective responsibility for the actions of the few reflects the reality of the Trojan situation—the consequences of the few

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 136.

<sup>27</sup> Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 135, sees all three speakers in the Trojan assembly (Antenor, Paris, Priam) as making “superficial attempts to include the community in the decision-making process.” Since his focus is on collective approbation, Elmer does not consider the rhetorical manipulation of the *idea* of the collective extensively (but his study certainly lays the groundwork).

<sup>28</sup> Nestor begins his speech by calling on the leader and the group (πολλοὶ γὰρ τεθνήσκει κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί, 7.328) and by alternating between what Agamemnon should do (τὼ σε χρὴ πόλεμον μὲν ἄμ' ἠοῖ παῦσαι Ἀχαιῶν, 331) and the responsibilities/actions of the group (αὐτοὶ δ' ἀγρόμενοι κυκλήσομεν ... κατακήμεν αὐτοὺς ... δείμομεν ὄκα / πύργους ὑψηλοὺς εἶλαρ νηῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν ... ἐν δ' αὐτοῖσι πύλας ποιήσομεν εὖ ἀραρυίας ... ὡς φαθ', οἳ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπήνησαν βασιλῆες, 332–344). This is typical of Nestor’s language throughout the epic. See R. P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca 1989) 106–109, and Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 32.

are paid by the many. His subsequent language is abrupt and urgent; as he calls for actions that will never be performed, his speech's dominant mood is pragmatic but defeatist. For, as the following scene indicates and as W. M. Sale has suggested, the Trojans simply lack the political institutions (and, thereby, traditions) to manage this conflict.<sup>29</sup>

The expectations of the assembly pattern are not disappointed when Paris, here taking the ironic position of the 'aggrieved' party shared by Agamemnon in Book 1, stands to speak (7.354–364). Paris' speech and its contents reflect importantly on Antenor's approach and on the situation in Troy. When Achilles induces Calchas to speak at the beginning of the poem, it is Achilles himself who first mentions Agamemnon (συμπάντων Δαναῶν, οὐδ' ἦν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπης, 1.90). Antenor, by contrast, neither speaks Paris' name nor blames him. Antenor's omission and circumlocution attests to the delicate dance of Trojan public speech; conversely, by appealing to the people directly and calling for their collective will to return the girl, Antenor may sound rebellious.

What the Trojans at large think of his proposal is left unsaid. Before Paris speaks, his language is marked as the private affair between two men: where Antenor's speech is clearly public address (ἀγορεύειν),<sup>30</sup> Paris seems to be addressing only Antenor with προσηύδα,<sup>31</sup> even though he has been clearly marked with

<sup>29</sup> According to Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 64, the Trojans cannot force Paris to give Helen back because "either they simply lack the political institutions to carry this out ... or else they want to fight." Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 136, is more forceful: Paris' response in this assembly "asserts a personal right to decide without regard for the will of the group."

<sup>30</sup> Nearly every instance of ἀγορεύειν in the narrative relates to a speech where a plan or proposal is made. Notable exceptions are Hephaistos' speech to Hera (1.572), Asios' prayer to Zeus (12.173), Achilles' vaunt over Lykaon (21.121), and his conversation with Thetis (24.142).

<sup>31</sup> Meaning simply to 'speak', verse final προσηύδα prefaces speeches to single addressees; *meta*-compounds direct speech to groups. On this distinction see H. Fournier, "Formules homériques de référence avec verbe 'dire'," *RPhil* 20 (1946) 31, 50–51, and 66; cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*<sup>2</sup>

the public turn of speaking formula as standing up among them (τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη):<sup>32</sup>

ἦτοι ὄ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο· τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη  
 δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο,  
 ὅς μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·  
 “Ἀντήνορ σὺ μὲν οὐκέτ' ἐμοὶ φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις·  
 οἶσθα καὶ ἄλλον μῦθον ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοῆσαι.  
 εἰ δ' ἐτεὸν δὴ τοῦτον ἀπὸ σπουδῆς ἀγορεύεις,  
 ἐξ ἄρα δὴ τοι ἔπειτα θεοὶ φρένας ὄλεσαν αὐτοί.  
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι μεθ' ἵπποδάμοις ἀγορεύσω·  
 ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπόφημι γυναῖκα μὲν οὐκ ἀποδώσω·  
 κτήματα δ' ὅσσ' ἀγόμεν ἐξ Ἄργεος ἡμέτερον δῶ  
 πάντ' ἐθέλω δόμεναι καὶ οἴκοθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖναι.”

“Antenor, no longer do you speak these things dear to me—  
 you know how to think up yet another *muthos* better than this.  
 If you say this truthfully in public and earnestly indeed,  
 then the gods themselves have surely already obliterated your wits.  
 But I will speak out publicly among the horse-taming Trojans:  
 I refuse this straight-out; I will not hand over the woman;  
 but, however many things I took from Argos to our home,  
 I am willing to give them back and to add other things from  
 my household.”

If Paris' speech introduction implies something disorderly, then his response confirms it.<sup>33</sup> His language echoes (or anticipates) the dynamic expanded between Polydamas and Hektor where

(Paris 2009) 664. There is play with this formulaic inheritance: in Ajax's speech to Odysseus (9.623 ff.) which clearly is *meant* to be heard by Achilles, the speech-introduction reflects this plural audience, despite the singular address (προσηύδα). See G. Machacek, “The Occasional Contextual Appropriateness of Formulaic Diction in the Homeric Poems,” *AJP* 115 (1994) 321–335, for violations of expectations set up by speech introductions in the *Odyssey*. Cf. Beck, *Homeric Conversation* 38–39.

<sup>32</sup> For the importance of these ‘standing’ formulas see W. Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin 1975) 116; Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 24–25.

<sup>33</sup> According to Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 10, Paris is “one aspect of Troy's *hamartia*, a man who puts legitimate self-interest ahead of his fellow citizens' equally legitimate interests.”

an advisor's good advice draws the ire of the prince.<sup>34</sup> Paris confirms Antenor's public speech but uses an understatement to dismiss him (his words are "no longer dear") and demeans this specific proposal by saying that he knows how to *think* better, rationalizing or minimizing the proposal by claiming that the gods have completely destroyed his thoughts.

Then Paris redirects his speech and announces that now he is in fact speaking publicly to all the Trojans (ἀντὰρ ἐγὼ Τρῶεσσι μεθ' ἵπποδάμοις ἀγορεύσω).<sup>35</sup> He refuses to return the girl (ἀντικρὸν δ' ἀπόφημι), but he does offer remuneration. Again, unlike the opening dispute when Agamemnon overreacts and is prompted by Achilles' counter-reaction to dangerous proposals, here the situation is compressed to one turn for each speaker followed by an intervention. Paris dismisses a proposal, nevertheless admits that something is wrong, and offers a counterproposal.<sup>36</sup> In the light of the oaths that have been broken and the severity of the siege, audience and Trojans alike know that his suggestion is pointless.

Paris' bellicose diction also points to the disjunction between the assembly context and the ruling family. For example, the adverb ἀντικρὸν is typically used to describe the movement of weapons.<sup>37</sup> Whereas Antenor attempts to create a collective identity, Paris eschews this conceit altogether. In his speech there is only the "you" of his antagonist (σύ, ἀγορεύεις, οἶσθα)

<sup>34</sup> See n.9 above. In Book 18 Hektor begins his response to Polydamas in the same way (18.285 = 7.757). Cf. Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 37, for Antenor's dismissal.

<sup>35</sup> For the assertive performative nature of this use of the future tense see J. P. Christensen, "First-Person Futures in Homer," *AJP* 131 (2010) 554.

<sup>36</sup> For the suggestion that Paris has no shame (*aidos*) whatsoever and that he simply refuses to entertain the suggestion in the manner of one who is socially "deviant" see R. Scodel, *Epic Facework: Self-presentation and Social Interaction in Homer* (Swansea 2008) 21; cf. 53 where Scodel argues that Paris "fundamentally lacks the concern for his reputation that drives other heroes."

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Kirk, *The Iliad* 282.

and the first-person inflection of his own actions (ἀγορεύσω, ἀποδώσω, ἀγόμεν, ἐθέλω).

The Homeric assembly pattern anticipates a mediator, and the formula τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη evokes this turn-taking. Again, we hear nothing of the assembly's reaction to the two speeches.<sup>38</sup> Where the debates of *Iliad* 1 among the Achaeans feature multiple speakers and respondents, the Trojan scene unfolds more like the divine assembly at the end of the epic when Apollo pleads for Hektor's burial and Hera opposes him (24.33–76). As in Book 1, the initial proposal is the 'safest' and perhaps more cosmically stabilizing choice. Agamemnon's dispute with Achilles meets with the failed mediation of Nestor and subsequent chaos; Zeus acts as a mediator and judge to affirm the rite of burial for Hektor. Priam's introductory lines only reinforce his position as a mediator—he is a counselor equal to the gods (θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος),<sup>39</sup> on equal footing with Nestor with the speech introduction (ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε).<sup>40</sup> Here, in Book 7, Priam stands for what seems to be a rather superficial iteration of the pattern. And as Priam stands forth as a mediator, his language, while accommodating, only valorizes the aims of his son.<sup>41</sup>

Unlike his son, Priam clearly speaks *to* the assembly (μετέειπε). And the style and content of his speech, then, disclose latent limits on dissent in the Trojan polity (7.365–379):

<sup>38</sup> Note the absence of Hektor in this scene. Schol. *Il.* 347a (III 282) suggests that he is silent because he is ashamed to end the conflict. Cf. Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 132–139.

<sup>39</sup> As a descriptive preface to a speech, θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος is unique. Two other characters are similarly described (14.318 Perithoos, 17.477 Patroklos), but neither is “especially renowned for council” (Kirk, *The Iliad* 282). Cf. *Od.* 2.10 and 3.409.

<sup>40</sup> Nestor is described thus four times (1.253, 2.78, 7.326, 9.95); see Dickson, *Nestor* 103, for this introduction and its implications. Cf. Scodel, *Listening to Homer* 70; Roisman, *CQ* 55 (2005) 24–27. This complete line also is applied to Thoas at 15.285 and Polydamas at 18.253.

<sup>41</sup> For Priam's support of his son see Sale, *GRBS* 35 (1994) 77–78; Nicolai, *Philologus* 127 (1983) 1–27.

ἦτοι ὅ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο· τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη  
 Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος, θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος,  
 ὅ σφιν εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε·  
 “κέκλυτέ μεν Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι,  
 ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.  
 νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἔλεσθε κατὰ πτόλιν ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,  
 καὶ φυλακῆς μνήσασθε καὶ ἐγρήγορθε ἕκαστος·  
 ἠῶθεν δ' Ἰδαῖος ἴτω κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας  
 εἰπέμεν Ἀτρείδης Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάῳ  
 μῦθον Ἀλεξάνδροιο, τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρε·  
 καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπέμεναι πυκινὸν ἔπος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι  
 παύσασθαι πολέμοιο δυσηχέος, εἰς ὃ κε νεκροὺς  
 κῆομεν· ὕστερον αὖτε μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε δαίμων  
 ἄμμε διακρίνη, δῶη δ' ἐτέροισί γε νίκην.”  
 ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἠδ' ἐπίθοντο·

And saying this he [Paris] sat down and among them rose  
 Dardanian Priam, a counselor equal to the gods—  
 well-intentioned towards them he spoke publicly and spoke  
 among them:

“Hear me Trojans and Dardanians and allies,  
 so that I may speak what the heart in my chest bids me.  
 Now, take your dinner throughout the city as you have before  
 and be mindful of the watch and keep each other awake.  
 At dawn let Idaios go to the curved ships  
 to repeat the plan of Alexandros, on whose account this conflict  
 has arisen,  
 to Atreus' sons, Agamemnon and Menelaos—  
 and also to propose this wise plan, if they wish  
 to stop the ill-sounding war until we have burned the corpses;  
 we will fight again later until the god separates us  
 and grants victory to one side at least.”

So he spoke and they all heard him and obeyed.

Priam's speech is at once similar to Nestor's before the Achaean council and Antenor's recent address. Like Nestor, Priam makes practical proposals for burial rites, but he also appropriates Antenor's rhetorical approach in calling to the Trojans and their allies as a collective (κέκλυτέ μεν Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι, / ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι

κελεύει). This repetition of Antenor’s opening lines demands some notice. Must Priam calm the assembly and keep their attention?<sup>42</sup> No Achaean gathering begins with such a request—in fact, an initial plea for attention may have a marked use in the *Iliad*; the imperative “hear me” is used for mixed groups where the authority of the speaker or the parameters of the speech-situation are in doubt.<sup>43</sup> Since Priam addresses a mixed group (allies and Trojans), it may be appropriate that he calls them to attention in the same way.<sup>44</sup> The context, on the other hand, suggests another explanation: perhaps there still is disorder in the assembly, both as a feature of Trojan assemblies in general and as an indication of ongoing reactions. Priam must command the attention of his people because they *are* disturbed by the exchange between Paris and Antenor—an exchange that dictates their fate in no small fashion.

Furthermore, Priam’s actions and words—as he commands his people to eat and set a guard—anticipate the authoritative closure of an assembly after the completion of mediation.<sup>45</sup> In short, before addressing the issues of the assembly, Priam pre-

<sup>42</sup> More than a dozen manuscripts omit these lines, but without them there would be no address at all. Kirk, *The Iliad* 282, is troubled by the fact that there is no variation from Antenor’s speech, but the close repetition may be intentionally jarring. Cf. *Il.* 8.5–6, where Zeus calls together the assembly of the gods and addresses them.

<sup>43</sup> For example, speeches made to the Achaeans *and* the Trojans before the duels (3.86, 97, 304, 7.67). Cf. Agamemnon’s closing threat to the Trojans at 3.456.

<sup>44</sup> Compare Hektor’s use of this address to rally the Trojans and their allies (8.497, 17.220). Cf. Mackie, *Talking Trojan* 91.

<sup>45</sup> For comparison see Nestor in Book 9 (53–78), who addresses the conflict between Diomedes and Agamemnon by a seeming agreement and a remonstrance followed by commands that maintain unity in the Achaean host under Agamemnon’s leadership. Note, however, the contrast in persons—where Priam uses the second-person imperative, Nestor uses the inclusive first-person plural: δόρπά τ’ ἐφοπλίσόμεσθα. φυλακτῆρες δὲ ἕκαστοι / λεξάσθων παρὰ τάφρον ὀρυκτὴν τείχεος ἐκτός (66–67). On this scene see Christensen, in *Reading Homer* 138–142.



emptively ends it without resolution. Only after issuing commands does he acknowledge the previous debate—with his fourth imperative he asks the herald to repeat to the sons of Atreus Paris' μῦθος and his own πυκινὸν ἔπος (an armistice for the burning of the dead, 375–376). As David Elmer notes, the speech separates those proposals that concern the common good and “the broader community” (a meal, posting of guards, etc., the πυκινὸν ἔπος) from those that are “more or less a private transaction,” Paris' offer of compensation but not Helen's return (here, the μῦθος).<sup>46</sup>

During this process, Antenor's suggestions have been forgotten. Note also that Priam's command is to relay the message to the two Atreidai (Ἀτρεΐδης Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάῳ); no thought is given to the Achaeans at large. Thus, Priam projects his understanding of the operation of power upon his adversaries. This point is worth contemplating further, because such a command is not typical: Chryses, for example, “begs all of the Achaeans, but the two Atreidai, leaders of the host, especially” (1.15–16: χρυσέω ἀνὰ σκῆπτρῳ, καὶ λίσσεται πάντας Ἀχαιοῦς, / Ἀτρεΐδα δὲ μάλιστα δύω, κοσμήτορε λαῶν). That Antenor, too, frames the solution to the conflict as giving Helen back to the Atreidai (δῶμεν Ἀτρεΐδησιν ἄγειν) illustrates a consistency in Trojan political understanding. For them, the war is between two noble families and each side is ruled accordingly.

Priam also uses contrasting diction to distinguish between his proposal and his son's. He qualifies his *epos* as *pukinon* (“wise”)<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 136–137.

<sup>47</sup> Martin (*Language of Heroes* 22) distinguishes between *muthos* and *epos* in that the former “implies authority and power” while “epos implies nothing about these values.” Thus, the *pukinon epos* corresponds to directives “set in a context of intimate relationship” (39, on 7.375, 11.788, Nestor to Patroklos; 24.75, Zeus on his order for Achilles; 24.744, Andromache referring to words of Hektor.) The contrast between the *muthos* of Paris, which is just a proposal, and the qualified *pukinon epos* may be indicated by phrases like πυκινὸν νόον (15.461), πυκινὴν ... βουλήν (2.55, 10.302, cf. 9.76; 14.294, cf.

and follows his cremation proposal with a statement in the future indicative: “we will fight (μαχησόμεθ’) again later until the god makes a distinction and gives victory to one of us” (377–378). This closing first-person plural verb, combined with his imperatives, attempts, however futilely, to end the assembly with an invocation of collective action. Coupled with the contrasting presentation of the plans, this statement may reveal his essential expectation. Priam, perhaps like the audience, has no doubt that the Achaeans will reject Paris’ proposal. What he does here by *not* pursuing the debate and by refraining from commenting on any possible negotiation between Paris and the Achaeans is to maintain familial and martial unity. The assembly ends with a line reserved for contexts in which everyone “hears and obeys” (οὐ δ’ ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἢ δ’ ἐπίθοντο),<sup>48</sup>

Priam, introduced as a mediator like Nestor, nevertheless seems to make a summary ruling like Zeus. In Priam’s case, however, the options in the debate are both dangerous. (But Zeus, to be fair, does choose a wider stability over serving the whims of his family.) Priam’s act, however, is more than a forgetful omission. The *Iliad* offers an illuminating coda to the Trojan assembly. Idaios’ speech to the Achaeans, in departing from a mere recitation of the assembly’s proceedings, elucidates Priam’s management of the debate and the latent tensions in the city. As what Irene de Jong calls secondary focalizers, mes-

---

*Hymn.Hom.Ven.* 38 and 243), πυκινὸν δόλον (6.187), or even πυκινὸν δόμον (e.g. 12.301), implying that the plan is well-made or well-fitted as the scholion suggests (schol. *Il.* 7.375 a [III 284]: πυκινόν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο ἀνακτῆσεται τοὺς κάμνοντας, ἴνα δὲ ὡς† ἐπιμιγνύμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἀφορμὴν τοῦ ποιήσασθαι εἰρήνην λάβωσιν. ὃ ἔσπευδον δ’ Ἑλληνας, τοῦτο δοκοῦσι χαρίζεσθαι). The implicate contrast, then, is that Priam’s plan is well-suited to the situation whereas Paris’ is not.

<sup>48</sup> The line follows seven speeches in the *Iliad* and, in marking unmitigated acceptance of the speeches’ directives, signals either an end to discussion or a renewal of action in battle (9.79, 14.133, 14.378, 15.300, 24.54, 24.738). Also, the subsequent narrative reinforces his authority: everyone eats and Idaios goes to the Achaeans (7.380–381).

sengers can reveal unspoken or even suppressed information in the way they “select, add to and interpret the information they have to convey.”<sup>49</sup> Idaios’ combination of Priam’s and Paris’ speeches, his additions and alterations, reveal possible Trojan reactions and suppressed dissent.

First, it is clear that Idaios confronts a difficult task—Priam has asked him to convey Paris’ *muthos* and his own *epos*. In performance, he also adds ideas from Antenor’s rejected speech. While it is not the case that all messenger speeches repeat the original instruction verbatim, Idaios’ task exceeds what is demanded of other messengers.<sup>50</sup> I chart here how Idaios combines and supplements these speeches;<sup>51</sup> this blending of authorized proposals and veiled dissent is a political act in itself:

<i>Priam and Paris’ Plans</i>	<i>Idaios’ Speech</i>
Priam, 7.373-374 εἶπέμεν Ἀτρεΐδης Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάῳ μῦθον Ἀλεξάνδροιο, τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρε	7.387-397 εἶπεῖν, αἶ κέ περ ὕμμι φίλον καὶ ἦδὺ γένοιτο, μῦθον Ἀλεξάνδροιο, τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρε
Paris, 363-364 κτῆματα δ’ ὅσσ’ ἀγόμεν ἐξ Ἄργεος ἡμέτερον δῶ	κτῆματα μὲν ὅσ’ Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλης ἐνὶ νηυσὶν

<sup>49</sup> I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (London 1987) 180–185, for innovations and variations in messenger speeches (quotation at 185). For messenger speeches as faithful repetitions see F. Létoublon, “Le bon orateur et le génie selon Anténor dans l’*Iliade*: Ménélas et Ulysse,” in J.-M. Galy and A. Thivel (eds.), *La rhétorique grecque* (Nice 1994) 29–40.

<sup>50</sup> See de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers* 180–185. Other speakers do speak “on their own initiative,” as de Jong puts it (181: Iris and Hypnos). Idaios’ speech falls somewhere between the ideal fidelity of messenger speeches and the radical “initiative” of a speaker like Iris, who, for example, departs from the recorded message to give advice and try to persuade Poseidon (15.158–218)

<sup>51</sup> For Idaios’ speech as “mainly made up of vv. reported from Paris and Priam just before, but ... enlivened by his personal additions,” see Kirk, *The Iliad* 284.

<p>πάντ' ἐθέλω δόμεναι καὶ οἴκοθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖναι</p> <p>Paris, 362 ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπόφημι γυναῖκα μὲν οὐκ ἀποδώσω·</p> <p>Priam, 375-378 καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπέμεναι πυκινὸν ἔπος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι παύσασθαι πολέμοιο δυσηχέος, εἰς ὃ κε νεκροῦς κῆομεν· ὕστερον αὐτε μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε δαίμων ἄμμε διακρίνη, δῶη δ' ἐτέροισί γε νίκην.</p>	<p>ἠγάγετο Τροίηνδ'· ὡς πρὶν ὄφελλ' ἀπολέσθαι· πάντ' ἐθέλει δόμεναι καὶ οἴκοθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖναι</p> <p>κουριδίην δ' ἄλοχον Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο οὐ φησιν δώσειν· ἦ μὴν Τρῶές γε κέλονται.</p> <p>καὶ δὲ τόδ' ἠνώγειν εἰπεῖν ἔπος αἴ κ' ἐθέλητε παύσασθαι πολέμοιο δυσηχέος εἰς ὃ κε νεκροῦς κῆομεν· ὕστερον αὐτε μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε δαίμων ἄμμε διακρίνη, δῶη δ' ἐτέροισί γε νίκην.</p>
--	--

Note that almost all of Idaios' modifications occur where he reports Paris' proposal. In general, the modifications and additions alter the tone of his message in bracing for negative Achaean response. But these alterations may have a political valence as well. First, Idaios' address is to all the Achaeans (Ἀτρεΐδη τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἀριστῆες Παναχαιῶν), and not just to Menelaos and Agamemnon as advised by Priam. Further, Idaios ascribes authority to his message by claiming that "Priam *and* the Trojans together order him to speak" (ἠνώγει Πρίαμός τε καὶ ἄλλοι Τρῶες ἀγαυοί); here he creates a Trojan entity to reflect the Achaean king-and-people paradigm that he has just invoked, and anticipates, perhaps, that he will deliver messages beyond those ordered by Priam.<sup>52</sup> This unified polity possesses a grammatical tension: ἠνώγει is singular. Priam orders, and everyone else may have been appended as an afterthought.

Regardless of whether we interpret Idaios as stumbling or delivering a coded message, he hedges about whether the *muthos*

<sup>52</sup> For Idaios' relay of Priam's instructions as a "private transaction" see Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 137; but the analysis above shows that Idaios communicates more than Priam intended.

of Alexander “will be sweet to his audience” (αἴ κέ περ ὕμμι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺν γένοιτο).<sup>53</sup> In effect, Idaios concedes that the proposal is not a sure thing. And he also attempts to gain the benevolence of his audience by deflecting blame from himself and the other Trojans, by isolating Paris (Ἀλεξάνδροιο, τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρε), by calling Helen “the wedded wife of glorious Menelaos” (κουριδίην δ’ ἄλοχον Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο),<sup>54</sup> and by opposing the Trojans’ wishes to Paris’ trouble-making (ἦ μὴν Τρῳέες γε κέλονται).

Apart from these blandishments, Idaios’ words also have a certain rhetorical agility. De Jong (183) has described this speech as an example of a messenger who can “change the mode of presentation ... from direct into indirect speech” and thus “make explicit the tone of the message conveyed or stress his/her role as an intermediary.” Idaios transforms and distances Paris’ declared refusal (οὐκ ἀποδώσω) through indirect discourse (οὗ φησιν δώσειν). But Idaios increases this distancing effect as well through the structure of his speech and the thematic opposition between Paris alone and the rest of the Trojans.

Although Idaios gives the *muthos* and *epos* in proper sequence, he nevertheless presents Paris’ propositions in reverse. While Paris refuses to return Helen but offers to return the goods (362–364), Idaios starts with Paris’ concession and interjects “would that he had perished,” to express a like-mindedness with his audience before he breaks the real news—Paris will not

<sup>53</sup> This, described as a *captatio benevolentiae* by de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers* 184, is an instance of a messenger changing the order of presentation for rhetorical reasons. Kirk compares *Il.* 4.17 where Zeus offers an “unusually polite address” to the other gods (*The Iliad* 284). Where Zeus is “unusually” (even menacingly?) polite, we should perhaps understand Idaios as nervous if not resigned (supported by the placement of περ and καί, 387).

<sup>54</sup> De Jong considers this word choice “indicative of [Idaios’] (and the other Trojans’) sentiment that Paris should have given Helen back” (*Narrators and Focalizers* 184). Kirk (*The Iliad* 284) says Idaios “fulsomely translates.”

give *her* back. Here, too, Idaios may communicate the sentiments of many Trojans—even Hektor wishes that his brother had died “childless and unmarried” (3.40).<sup>55</sup> Most importantly, Idaios suspends the outcome of Paris’ message by enjambling the main point (“he says he will not return,” οὐ φησιν δώσειν) in the following line (393).<sup>56</sup> And, to add indignation to suspense, he reveals that Paris will not return Helen, *even though* the Trojans ask it. Idaios polarizes the Trojan city through other contrasts as well. His verbs stage a contest between the desires of all the Trojans (with Priam) and the destructive behavior of one (Paris). Although the command was Priam’s, Idaios uses third-person plural verbs to contrast with Paris’ solitary actions. And, for the external audience, the opposition between the selfish desires of the leader and the common concern of the people recalls the tension in Book 1 where the Achaeans shout en masse for Agamemnon to accept Chryses’ offer.<sup>57</sup>

Significantly, then, Idaios alters his message’s author(s). Instead of reporting Priam’s *pukinon epos*, he announces that Priam and the rest of the Trojans order him to propose this *epos* (294, καὶ δὲ τόδ’ ἠνώγεον εἰπεῖν ἔπος): Priam’s speech verbatim. Idaios creates a unified image of the Trojans to balance that of Agamemnon and the Achaeans, defined together and against the disunity that Paris represents. With an impossible wish for Paris’ earlier death (390, ὡς πρὶν ὄφελλ’ ἀπολέσθαι), he marks the separation between the strife’s cause and those who suffer for it while also implying that the other Trojans feel the same way. Finally, his assertion that the rest of the Trojans have asked Paris to return Helen along with his revelation that

<sup>55</sup> Compare Helen in her lament for Hektor (24.764; cf. Kirk, *The Iliad* 284, on 389–390). Such sentiments are not inherently Trojan—Achilles wishes that Briseis had perished previously (19.59–60).

<sup>56</sup> According to de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers* 183, Idaios thus “dissociates himself from Paris’ statement, which he, like the other Trojans, is not pleased with.”

<sup>57</sup> On the critical disruption initiated by this moment see Elmer, *Poetics of Consent* 30–31 and 71–74.

the Trojans and Priam have proposed something more reasonable—to cremate the dead—increases the distance between the two parties and their respective proposals.

In this way, then, Idaios uses distancing techniques to preserve himself and to separate Paris from the other Trojans. Such obfuscation could leave the impression that Priam stands with the rest of the Trojans against Paris. Here, then, from the level of the composition of the *Iliad*, Paris is set up as a selfish leader, like Agamemnon or even Achilles, whose personal needs bring destruction upon his people.

### *Conclusions*

Idaios' visit to the Achaeans reminds us that Book 7 offers a fragmented mirror-scene for *Iliad* 1. In Book 7, Paris is an Agamemnon who refuses to give up a woman even though it would be better for his people. Antenor is at once the voice of compromise and of dissent. This scene further reminds us that Book 1 recapitulates general themes of the Trojan War. There is a palpable irony throughout the *Iliad* in Agamemnon's indignation over the loss of Chryseis, his seizure of Briseis, and the cause of the entire expedition.

This investigation also elucidates Priam's difficult position and the linguistic agility of his seemingly bland speech as he copes with the conflict between the interests of his son and the interests of the city. His language reflects a tension between obligations to his people and to a son for whom his patience wanes; his words work between their own lines—he engages in “off-record conversation strategies.”<sup>58</sup> His use of speech anticipates what much of the epic shows, namely, that Trojan rhetoric functions to marginalize dissent and maintain an embattled unity as the status quo.

The Trojan assembly and Idaios' subsequent visit to the Achaean camp expose differences in the Achaean and the

<sup>58</sup> For such “off-record” speech strategies in Homer see M. Lloyd, “The Politeness of Achilles: Off-record Conversation Strategies,” *JHS* 124 (2004) 75–89.

Trojan pursuit of political order. In contrast to Achaean procedures, the Trojan assembly has no set order; once a prince or king speaks, the debate ends. Although the Achaeans publicly misuse language in the *agore*—indeed, the rejection of Achilles in Book 1 sets a pattern to be repeated and re-interpreted with Antenor’s appearance—Trojan advisors appear to have no opportunities to ply their trade. Trojan rhetoric reflects this as it refuses debate. The rejection of Antenor constitutes the rejection of beneficial, albeit impossible, advice. Priam’s careful speech and Idaios’ message point to the restrictions placed on debate and language’s potential in the Trojan assembly. In addition, if this scene reflects deliberations preceding the war, the *Iliad* repositions the failure of speech (both the limitation of debate and the barring of dissent) as a partial cause of Trojan suffering. Finally, the unfolding of these themes marks this scene (and Book 7) as essential to the portrayal of political differences and reveals its importance to the epic’s overall rumination on politics and political institutions. Although the Achaeans face terrible consequences for their mistakes in Book 1, their coalition survives (in this epic). This *Iliad* integrates political themes throughout its story to attribute the fall of the city, at least in part, to a failure of its institutions.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>59</sup> A version of this paper was originally presented at the conference “Homer on the Range” at the University of Texas at Austin (2012) and improved by discussion there. Some of the work originated in a dissertation advised by David Sider, Michèle Lowrie, and Leonard Muellner and influenced by correspondence with David Elmer and Elton Barker. In addition, the comments of the editorial board and anonymous referee of *GRBS* helped to clarify the argument greatly.



## TABLES

## 1. Achaean Assemblies and Councils

Type	Citation	Issue	Results
<i>Impromptu Assembly 1</i>	1.16-32	Return of Chryseis to her father	Rejection of the suppliant; plague on the Achaeans
<i>Assembly 1</i>	1.54-305	The plague; return of Chryseis; replacement prize for Agamemnon	Return of Chryseis; strife between Agamemnon and Achilles; Achilles' departure from the coalition
<i>Council 1</i>	2.53-83	Preparing the troops to return to war	Nestor directs the <i>basileis</i> to heed Agamemnon's plan
<i>Assembly 2</i>	2.94-393	Agamemnon's test of the army; Thersites' 'mutiny'; preparations for war	Agamemnon's test reveals the troops want to go home; Odysseus and Nestor rally them; Agamemnon retains control
<i>Council 2</i>	2.432-441	Nestor advises Agamemnon to start the battle	Agamemnon starts the battle
<i>Council 3</i>	7.323-343	Nestor advises they request an armistice for the burial of the dead and build defensive walls	Acceptance
<i>Assembly 3</i>	7.382-411	Audience for Idaios' message from the Trojans	Public refusal of Paris' offer
<i>Assembly 4</i>	9.9-79	Agamemnon proposes departure	Diomedes rejects his proposal; Nestor ratifies Diomedes' comments and dissolves assembly
<i>Council 4</i>	9.89-172	Nestor proposes that Agamemnon make amends to Achilles	Agamemnon agrees and promises gifts for Achilles; Nestor selects emissaries
<i>Council 5</i>	9.669-711	Embassy reports Achilles' refusal	Diomedes dismisses Achilles' response and calls for a renewed battle effort
<i>Council 6</i>	10.201-254	Agamemnon asks for volunteers to spy on the Trojans	Diomedes and Odysseus depart to spy on the Trojans
<i>Impromptu Council 1</i>	14.64-132	Agamemnon proposes retreat	Diomedes proposes that the leaders re-enter battle to rally the troops

<i>Impromptu Council 2</i>	15.281-300	Hektor is killing everyone	Toas suggests that the best fighters band together
<i>Assembly 5</i>	19.40-275	Achilles' return	Public reconciliation of Agamemnon and Achilles; Odysseus acts as mediator
<i>Assembly 6</i>	23.256-897	Funeral games for Patroklos; arguments between Idomeneus and the lesser Ajax and Menelaus and Antilochus	Reintegration of Achilles; political experimentation; Achilles mediates the first conflict

## 2. Divine Political Meetings

Type	Citation	Issue	Results
<i>Assembly 1</i>	4.2-71	Proposal to end the war	Zeus capitulates to continue the war; Athena is to restart the conflict
<i>Pseudo-Council 1</i>	7.445-463	Poseidon is angry over the building of the Achaean wall	Zeus assures him that his honor will not be destroyed
<i>Assembly 2</i>	8.4-41	The gods have been interfering with Zeus' plan	Zeus orders the gods not to interfere
<i>Pseudo-Council 2</i>	8.439-485	Athena and Hera are angry with Zeus	Zeus explains his plans
<i>Pseudo-Council 3</i>	16.431-458	Zeus wants to save Sarpedon	Hera convinces Zeus that the other gods would disapprove; Zeus relents
<i>Assembly 3</i>	24.33-76	Debate over the return of Hektor's body	Zeus intervenes in a dispute between Hera and Apollo and arranges for the return of Hektor's body

## 3. Trojan Assemblies and Councils

Type	Citation	Issue	Results
<i>Assembly 1</i>	2.786-808	[Unclear; the assembly is standing when Iris appears]	Hektor prepares the army for war
<i>Council (?)</i>	3.146-161	The Trojan elders (without Hektor) contemplate Helen	They long for Helen to be sent away
<i>Pseudo-Council 1</i>	5.427-497	Sarpedon (leader of Hektor's allies) criticizes Hektor for his war strategy	Hektor does not respond verbally; he fights harder
<i>Pseudo-Council 2</i>	6.67-117	Helenos advises Hektor to have sacrifices performed	Hektor has sacrifices performed

<i>Pseudo-Council 3</i>	6.254-496	Hektor receives advice from Hecuba (rest), Helen (rest), and Andromache (fight from within the walls)	Hektor rejects their advice
<i>Assembly 2</i>	7.335-379	Antenor proposes the return of Helen; Priam proposes an armistice for the burial of the dead	Idaios is sent to the Achaeans
<i>Assembly 3</i>	8.489-542	Hektor discusses where to pass the night	Hektor commands the troops to make their camps outside the city
<i>Pseudo-Council 4</i>	12.60-83	Polydamas advises Hektor not to cross the Achaean fortifications in chariots	Hektor takes his advice
<i>Pseudo-Council 5</i>	12.210-250	Polydamas advises Hektor on the interpretation of a bird omen	Hektor violently rejects his advice
<i>Pseudo-Council 6</i>	13.723-748	Polydamas advises Hektor to gather the best men and consider whether to push to the Achaean ships	Hektor gathers the best men to fight
<i>Assembly 4</i>	18.243-313	Polydamas addresses a spontaneous assembly on whether to retreat into the city now that Achilles has returned	Hektor violently rejects Polydamas and threatens anyone who opposes his plan; the narrative calls the Trojans "fools"
<i>Pseudo-Council 7</i>	22.38-130	Hecuba and Priam plead for Hektor not to face Achilles	Hektor does not respond; he faces Achilles

September, 2014

Dept. of Philosophy and Classics  
 Univ. of Texas at San Antonio  
 joel.christensen@utsa.edu