

The Stranger's Friendship on the Battlefield: The Performance of *Xenia* in the *Iliad*

Tsai, Hsiu-chih*

Abstract

This paper aims to study the meeting of Diomedes and Glaucus in Book 6 of the *Iliad* in relation to the practice of the religious and cultural code of *xenia* (guest-friendship), which the ancient Greeks formulated as the major institution for consolidating the inter-household and intercity relationships. In the literary world of the *Iliad*, *xenia* is vividly represented in several places as the Greek warriors' respect for the cultural institution and for the philosophy of ethics and morality that lies behind it. The episode of Diomedes and Glaucus' confrontation with each other on the battlefield in the Trojan War from Book 6, the *Iliad*, is examined as an example to demonstrate the importance of this ethical code. The description of the two great warriors' refusal to fight with each other on the battlefield provides a social and cultural space to elucidate the significance of this religious and cultural custom. Through this, the epic narrative transforms the battlefield into a social space of production where ethics and the religious and cultural code reinforce each other's necessity and importance in a society that obeys not just the edicts of the kings but also the law of Olympus.

Keywords: Homer, the *Iliad*, *xenia* (guest-friendship), *polis*, social space

97.02.12 收稿，97.07.31 通過刊登。

* Associate professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, National Taiwan University.

Homer (eight century B.C.), the blind poet who starts the very first chapter of Greek literature and the very beginning of European literature, occupies a very important but mystic position in literary history. Although we know nothing about Homer except his name and that “Greeks believed that he was blind” (Lawall 100), there is nothing left in historical records for us to retrieve the image or fantasy of this great literary man of the ancient Greek. Despite this uncertainty, the blind poet “Homer” is accredited as being the author of two epics—the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Although these two epics are attributed to him, scholars have different opinions concerning their real authorship. Sir Maurice Bowra points out that “the problem of Homeric authorship has caused trouble for three hundred years, and its final solution still eludes us” (Bowra 9) and moreover, at later times, Homer as a person is effaced of his personality (Vivante 4). Bloom contends that “we don’t even know whether Homer was one man or two, or perhaps the name for a school of bards, a tradition of storytellers who chanted the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* aloud to rapt audiences. And yet whoever edited and revised the two epics into their current form was himself a genius” (Bloom 9).

Except for the dispute among scholars and critics about the authenticity and authority of the two epic poems, it is generally agreed that these two masterpieces were finally given their present form by one single poet (Lawall 100), and that most of the contemporary readers see “the two great epic poems as rather imposing unities, and not a medley of voices” (Bloom 9). Though composed “on the western sea-coast of Asia Minor,” they occupy a very special status in both Greek and European literature in that they do represent the spirit and characteristics of European and Greek literature¹ (Bowra 1).

In fact it was through these two epics that ancient Greek literature and culture was vividly introduced to the world. They help form our understanding of the ancient Greeks and their conception of certain events of the Mycenaean Age

¹ Even though these two epics “stand in isolated splendour and have no predecessors,” Bowra believes that the two poems demonstrate a longstanding artistic and literary tradition to which the poet or poets should be greatly indebted. Judging from the poems themselves, Bowra stands by the idea that the two epics are products of a mature literature. He states that “the literary devices such as similes, the names of the chief personalities, the outline of the main episodes, the frequent use of speeches, the repeated lines which keep the story going, the standard epithets for persons and places and things, the unwillingness of the poets to state their own views or to pass judgments on the action” are never a burgeoning technique adopted for the first time by the poet/poets and he contends: “The poems use this technique and this material with a confident command” (Bowra 2).

(1600-1200 B.C.).² The *Iliad*, usually assumed to be the earlier work of the two, depicts the story of the Greek warriors sailing across the Aegean Sea to fight with the Trojans³ to bring back Melenlaus' wife—the beautiful Helen. The *Iliad*, with this rescue mission as a major theme, and the war between the Greeks and the Trojans and their alliances as the complex base of this story of heroic deeds and family ties, has a quite different textuality of themes, plots and narrative structures from Odysseus's wandering experiences on the sea after the Trojan War in the *Odyssey*. The *Iliad* has war as its subject and emphasizes in its verse the emotional and characteristic conflicts that warriors are forced to confront and deal with on the

2 With new proof found out and tested in the field of linguistics by the collaboration between the British architect Michael Ventris and the Cambridge linguist John Chadwick in *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (published in 1956), eighty years after Heinrich Schliemann's archaeological discovery, it is affirmed that "the Mycenaeans were Greeks" and "the bearers of Mycenaean culture were really Greeks" (Latacz 155). The Mycenaean Age was contemporaneous with the late Bronze Age and is named for the enormous stone citadel of Mycenae in the Peloponnesus (Powell 1998, 26). At this period "Mycenaean cities had Cyclopean stone walls, massive gateways and protecting towers," (Bowra 82) which formed the palace societies as the geographical foundation for the flourishing of the epic tradition (Osborne 206). The Mycenaean culture "grew out of the Minoan culture" and by invading Crete at about 1400 B.C. the Greeks brought new changes to the old culture. The site of the Mycenaean culture was supposed to be "taken over by Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans about 1650s B.C.; immensely wealthy tombs from about 1600 B.C. prove its richness and importance and provide a convenient date for the beginning of the Mycenaean Age" (Powell 1998, 26). The Mycenaean Greeks were powerful and remarkably rich who were "lovers of war" and "used bronze weapons, rode to battle in horse-drawn chariots, and concentrated great wealth in their hands" (Powell 1998, 26). They might have called themselves Achaeans, and it is surmised that the Trojan War had weakened the Achaean power, even though the Achaeans did beat down the Trojans and kill all the sons of Priam, the Trojan king, and put all the women into servitude for the Greeks: "The male children of all the Trojan heroes were slaughtered (Hector's young boy Astyanax was thrown from the walls), the women were enslaved and taken back to Greece, to be concubines in their conqueror's beds, or to card flax and draw water at the spring below the palace of Sparta. After the massacre, Agamemnon's army plundered and burned Troy, and razed its walls" (Wood 25). However, this glory did not last long, for merely "some fifty years or so after the war the Mycenaean empire...the Mycenaean civilization, collapsed" (Bowra 84).

3 It is the pioneering archaeological work done by Heinrich Schliemann from 1868 at Hisarlik, Turkey that provides a picture of the landscape of Troy and the Trojan society to the present knowledge of the geographical world of Homer's "holy Ilios," the city of Priam (Wood 1998, Luce 1998).

battlefield. The narration of the *Iliad* evolves around the battlefield—a special living space that encloses warriors in fierce combat, a particular space where heroes and dead bodies freely express the desperate conditions of the mortals. In this cruel territory Homer gives life to his characters and makes them immortal in his epic narration.

The *Iliad* vividly represents Greek soldiers' pride and heroic deeds, the Trojan warriors' desperate fight to protect their home country, and the romance of Paris and Helen that drives this fierce, ten-year war and figures as the main plot of the epic. Besides these distinctive plots of the *Iliad*, there are some obtrusive narrations such as para-narratives and inserted plots that interrupt the flow of the narrative. Para-narratives, which "could be omitted without disturbing the course of the primary narrative," though usually taken to serve artistic functions, could be read as types of paradigms that activate the initiation of the audience (Alden 23). The inserted plot, as purposely inserted digression in a major plot, is my concern in this paper. I would like to take the brief encounter of Diomedes and Glaucus on the battlefield in Book 6 of the *Iliad* as my example and argue that inserted plot is worthy of our attention, for this kind of interruption might offer us an alternative perspective to further examine its significance in a broader textual, and indeed inter-textual, socio-cultural milieu. The inserted plot can thus serve the particular function of *punctum* which can open an interstice, a new space in the text to other textual or inter-textual space.

The description of the meeting of Diomedes and Glaucus has long been the focus of many scholastic concerns. From the analysis of the strategies of the self-contained digression in the oral poetry in the Homeric poetics,⁴ the analysis of the divine unpredictability in the linguistic and communicative strategies presented in this Homeric hospitality scene,⁵ the oral theory and the moral and aesthetic

4 Julia Haig Gaisser pays attention to the aesthetic effects achieved in the Homeric oral poetry and compares the poetic resemblance and the material of the revealing of self-identity in Diomedes' story of Lycurgus and Glaucus' genealogy in "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaucus-Diomedes Episode." Gaisser also refers to various different scholastic interpretations of the possible relation between stories of Lycurgus and Bellerophon in Gilbert Murray's *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford 1907), and the possible linkage of Diomedes' account of Lycurgus and Glaucus' account of Bellerophon to that of Achilles' story of Peleus in Book 24 in T. B. L. Webster's *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958) and H. L. Lorimer's *Homer and the Monuments* (London 1950).

5 In "The Wits of Glaucus," Ruth Scodel emphasizes the importance of the dialogue of the two warriors and lays stress on the theme of divine unpredictability and links the episode to a wider context that might enlighten not just Book 6 but the complete twenty-four

approaches to the past family genealogy,⁶ from the theme of human prowess and mortal vulnerability,⁷ to the economic interpretation of the gift-giving practice and the reversal of the implied expectation of reciprocity,⁸ scholars' interest in this brief episode remains fervent, as diversified approaches are adopted and many different perspectives are brought into the discussion. I would like to suggest that the Diomedes-Glaucus meeting be taken as the *punctum*, a particular incident which can potentially arouse us to certain acuteness when we look into the implied constitution of the cultural and the social space of production in the Homeric world, therefore furthering our understanding of the plot and the textuality of Book 6 and even of the twenty-four Books of the *Iliad*. This is not only because of the obtrusive materiality of the meeting and its particular position within the structuration of the epic narrative, but also because that deep within the structural and material obtrusiveness, lies one of the recurrent themes of the whole epic, the code of *xenia* (ξενία). Through the re-incorporation of this code into the Homeric world, it might shed new light on things, possibly facilitating a re-mapping of the textual and the cultural space of the epic.

In *Camera Lucida*, Roland Barthes emphasizes the importance of the function of the *punctum* for revealing new nuances to the reading and interpretation of photographs. He tries to explain the very nature of this function as an agitating force: *punctum* is “sting, speck, cut, little hole—and also a cast of the dice. A photograph's *punctum* is that accident which pricks me (but also bruises me, is poignant to me)” (Barthes 27). It is *punctum* that makes a photograph significant and stops its existence as mere “*stadium*”—“a kind of general, enthusiastic commitment, of course, but without special acuity” (Barthes 26) *Punctum*, the agitating force, the odd, dissonant element that emits certain heterogeneous, inharmonious notes in the texture, hence turns itself into a valuable and significant part in the narrative

Books of the *Iliad*.

6 It is the moral choice and the cultural perceptions of the Greeks demonstrated by Diomedes that Byron Harries values highly in his interpretation of the recounting of the Lycurgus tale and Glaucus' genealogy in “‘Strange Meeting’: Diomedes and Glaucus in *Iliad* 6”.

7 Stephen Fineberg, in “Blind Rage and Eccentric Vision in *Iliad* 6,” tries to interpret the meeting of the two great warriors in terms of mortal prowess and vulnerability as the theme of Book 6.

8 Walter Donlan (“The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy”) tries to interpret the episode in terms of implied inequality in the relationship represented in the Homeric description of Diomedes' and Glaucus' renewal of their ancestral guest-friendship and gift exchanging.

structure as the textual and inter-textual milieus are concerned. Based upon this understanding, I would like to focus on one particular obtrusive interstice in Book 6 of the *Iliad*, the narrative of Diomedes and Glaucus' encounter on the battlefield, as the *punctum* of the narrative structure. This obtrusive encounter on the battlefield, the problematic fragment under frequent critical debates, when treated as the *punctum*, is going to release a new tone—the metonymic power of expansion in the text, and thus bring in a more profound “detail” which sheds new light on the understanding of the narrative structure and the social and cultural context of the ancient Greek world, for this is the very function of *punctum*—“when, paradoxically, while remaining a ‘detail,’ it fills the whole picture” (Barthes 45). It is this function that sheds the significant light of detail to the whole literary textuality, and moreover, to the inter-textuality between the literary text and the special space of the *Iliad*, a Homeric Greek life-world⁹ whose social, political space is intertwined with religious, cultural and ethical code.

Taking the self-contained digression of both Diomedes' story of Lycurgus and Glaucus' account of his grandfather Bellerophon, and the subsequent reconciliation and renewal of the ancestral *xenia* (guest-friendship) between Diomedes and Glaucus as an instance of *punctum*—the textual eye-catching gadget or design that arouses special attention to the poetic and aesthetic design in the narrative structure, we could view the description of Diomedes and Glaucus' encounter on the battlefield as a performance and demonstration of the political influence and regulatory power of the Greek religious and cultural code of *xenia* on the social lives of the Greeks. Furthermore, I would argue that as the oral recitation and performance of the epic is presented, the Greek ethical code and the significance of cultural notes are successfully delivered through the narration of the inserted event. The recitation and performance of the *Iliad* could decisively fulfill the function of moral teaching and thus, reach the goal of reminding its audience of the customs and codes that all Greeks are supposed to follow through its retelling of the stories past and fictional. Moreover, a performance like this one, inserted into the narrative, would definitely reveal to future readers a vivid portrait of the Greek way of life, as well as their belief system and conceptualization of the world.

⁹ Although scholars question and dispute the time period of the Homeric world, Robin Osborne in his study of Greek society in the late Bronze Age and early Iron Age, based upon the archaeological excavation and records and the social and political arrangements implied or alluded to in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, pictures the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the Greek world of the late eighth century (Osborne 216). In “The Use and Abuse of Homer,” Ian Morris, instead of directly positioning Homer at a particular time period, proposes the alternative of placing Homeric society and culture in the eighth century (Morris 58).

I. *Xenia*: the Reciprocal Relationship that Obtains between Host and Guest

In ancient times, though large level transactions and business were rare, inter-city and inter-national encounters still occupied a significant part of the history and lives of the Greek people, with sailors traveling and transacting among the many places and countries around the Aegean Sea. The ancient Greeks traveling to various places by sea and meeting with people from different places cultivated a profound understanding and experience of being a stranger in a foreign land. While inter-city visits, trades and transactions did occur, conflicts and misunderstandings brought by the encounter of different cultures were not uncommon features of border-crossings.¹⁰ The ancient Greeks have the experience of being strangers and travelers when crossing borders and traveling and visiting other lands. The encounter of different cultures and races in ancient times, though not as widespread as nowadays, are no less important when the confrontation of the other concerns both the problematic of the concept of *polis*¹¹ (city-state) and of *xenia* (hospitality).

¹⁰ Receiving and entertaining strangers at one's household as one of the characteristics of the code of *xenia* assumes that traveling outside one's hometown sometimes incur unpredictable dangers and destructions. Behind the code of *xenia* is thus the presumption that mortal vulnerability is universal.

¹¹ "Most scholars now agree that Homer's world, while embodying artifacts from earlier times, from the Bronze Age and the Iron Age, is mostly the world of his own day, the early Archaic Period of the eighth century BC, now called the Greek Renaissance....If we can trust Homer's testimony, the *polis*, usually translated 'city-state,' the characteristic manner of political organization in the Classical Period, was even then coming into being" (Powell 2007, 59).

"The classical *polis* was a development of the *oikos* or 'household' as an economic unit with a structure of authority" (Powell 2007, 59-60). The household of Odysseus on Ithaca is such an *oikos*. According to M. I. Finley, "The authoritarian household, the *oikos*, was the centre around which life was organized, from which flowed not only the satisfaction of material needs, including security, but ethical norms and values, duties, obligations, and responsibilities, social relationships, and relations with the gods. The *oikos* was not merely the family, it was all the people of the household and its goods; hence 'economics' (from the Latinized form, *oecus*), the art of managing an *oikos*, meant running a farm, not managing to keep peace in the family" (Finley 66).

The support Telemachus in the *Odyssey* sought from outside to hold an assembly of neighboring *oikoi* demonstrates the *polis* in process. Such assemblies of the *oikoi*, as Powell points out, "will later grow the full-blown legislative bodies of the classical *polis*." It is through the consolidation of "many *oikoi* into a single unit" that a classical

Xenia (ξενία) is primarily a Greek word for hospitality (Katz 50), generosity, or “a formal institution of friendship” (Powell 1998, 140) shown to a stranger-traveler who comes to one’s house. It is usually translated as “guest-host” relationship whose normal function is based upon the reciprocal relationship between two *xenoi* (*xenos* is a Greek word for traveler, stranger, foreigner, guest or friend). The Greek god Zeus is said to be god of travelers and thus referred to as Zeus *Xenios* as he presides over the laws of hospitality and protects strangers and travelers. In the Greek social and cultural context, initially casual or trading visits can also be further cemented as ties between two groups or families with the religious and cultural code of *xenia*. The custom of *xenia* helped establish and sustain a social and political relationship between two households or political entities through the long distance guest-host friendship. Its ultimate sustenance is the reciprocity of hospitality—an obligation that entails the exchange of hospitality and the duty to take care of one another when each visits the other’s country.

In the Greek culture, *xenia* is a custom highly emphasized and respectfully practiced by most Greek civilians. It is a kind of friendship between the stranger or traveler and his host. Based upon the hospitality of the host towards the stranger-guest, this kind of friendship evolves into a connection and relationship between the stranger-traveler family and the host family. Surrounded by the sea, the Greek people are accustomed to sail the Aegean Sea and travel around various islands. With the capricious conditions of the weather and the sea, the Greeks were never guaranteed a safe return home. They knew well how a ferocious wind might bring them to a foreign land and how much they would need the hospitality and help of some host to help them set sail again towards home. Hence the Greeks make it a common rule, a cultural code that no matter who the stranger is, the host has to invite him in his house and give him accommodation, entertainment, and precious gifts so as to commemorate their friendship. Through their belief in the Olympian gods, especially Zeus *Xenios* (the masculine of *xenia*), the god of travelers, ancient Greeks made *xenia* a cultural and religious code in their daily life performance, and believed if they did not receive and treat the stranger to their door heartily and warmly, they might be punished by Zeus *Xenios*.

polis is to be established. Moreover, “the polis was a kind of miniature state that unified its diverse members through common goals and myths and a place of assembly (*agora*) for all adult males to meet and make decisions affecting the group.... A *polis* is focused on a god or gods who embody its strength and spirit and sponsor its success. The gods are ritually flattered in having their own precincts or temples” (Powell 2007, 60). The Homeric epic, as a product of the Greek Renaissance, represents, to a certain extent, the gradual formation and consolidation of the becoming of the *polis*.

This kind of hospitality towards the stranger-traveler makes up the Greek custom of *xenia*. Bearing this custom in mind, the Greeks could hope to enjoy a safe trip to far away places free from danger, starvation, or destitution because *xenia* demands the host to receive the stranger/traveler into his household, entertain him, and give him abundant gifts:

All the acts of hospitality have a similar symbolic aspect—acceptance, the production of food and drink, the inquiry (only after the guest has eaten) who he is, the bath which is dwelt on at length because ‘the traveler only counts as fully at home and accepted, when the dust of travel has been washed away’; the gift at parting, which marks the connection of host and guest as an enduring one to be appealed to in time to come and reciprocated, as a matter of right, when opportunity offers. The giving of a gift and the receiving of a gift established a relation of *ξενίη*, friendship, which could be effective generations later. (Griffin 27)

The Greeks believed that by valuing *xenia* as one of their most precious customs, they could expect to receive similar treatment from this stranger someday in the future if they would one day visit his home (Katz, Powell 1998, 2007). To further extend their power and influence to the milieu of *polis* (city-state), the powerful Greek families would further make use of this custom to strengthen their friendships with families from various city-states, and thus consolidate the inter-city relationship with their alliances. From then on,

The stranger who had a *xenos* in a foreign land—and every other community was foreign soil—had an effective substitute for kinsmen, a protector, representative, and ally. He had a refuge if he were forced to flee his home, a store-house on which to draw when compelled to travel, and a source of men and arms if drawn into battle. There were all personal relations, but with the powerful lords the personal merged into the political, and then guest-friendship was the Homeric version, or forerunner, of political and military alliances. (Finley 118)

One of the themes of Homer's *Odyssey* is the examination of this kind of guest-friendship performed by various hosts when Odysseus travels to various households during his long journey back home and also while his son Telemachus leaves Ithaca to track down more news about his father (Crotty 114). In the *Iliad*, the code of *xenia* is even more important, for the Greek alliance was formed at the call of *xenia*. As M. I. Finley vividly describes: “To recruit an army among outsiders in what was, to begin with, only a family feud over a stolen wife, Agamemnon naturally made the fullest use of his guest-friends” (Finley 119). We might therefore

surmise that without the proper function and the successful manipulation of the code of *xenia*, the Trojan War might not even have the tiniest chance of getting started.

The encounters of different cultures and the acceptance and re-incorporation of the other, that is, the hospitality that a host shows to a guest or a stranger, therefore, becomes crucial as far as the differences and conflicts of the two cultures are concerned. Misunderstandings might always occur while different cultural elements, expectations and behavioral gestures are in opposition or conflict with each other. However, the Greeks set up their own rule and code *xenia* for taking in the stranger as a guest, whereby the host, demonstrating his hospitality, relates the two families and houses with another layer of friendship that engages the traveler's house to return reciprocal reception and hospitality to the host's house and family in the future.¹²

However, encountering persons from outside the political territory brings the host a kind of knowledge that even the frequent contact with usual strangers from the same political, social and cultural domain would not have made available. It means the code of *xenia* embodies in itself the possible confrontation of heterogeneous elements in every possible level—cultural, social, political and even psychological. When visiting foreign city-states became a trend in the ancient Greek world, more and more occasions of cross-cultural encounters were expected and these frequent inter-cultural encounters subsequently brought forth different cultural conflicts. Solutions of conflicts thus demanded more understanding, appreciation and respect from both sides. Usually such frequent inter-cultural encounters did not necessarily result in harmonious international relationship, nor consequently guaranteed any bilateral economic and cultural benefits. The flow of people from one city-state to another caused much anxiety, distrust, resistance and antagonism in many host nations. In such a context, the concept of hospitality bestowed upon the guest strangers by the host city-state thus became important insofar as the vulnerability of human beings was concerned. The Greek wisdom in keeping a close and peaceful bond between two households provided the Greek way of *xenia* sealed in their institutionalized concept of inter-household relationship. The code of *xenia* later developed into a strong intercity bond which consolidated the possible linkage of the traditional kinship system to a broader sense of mutual defense and protection against invasion from potential leagues of adversaries. This is the very spirit of alliance which supported the allies in the Trojan War and their close bonds, apart from the traditional kinship system, making the episode of the meeting between

12 It is demanded by the code of *xenia* that the guest should express his respect to the host in reciprocal reception.

Diomedes and Glaucus significant with its implication of the power of *xenia*.

By incorporating the participation of Zeus and Olympian gods, *xenia*, the Greek concept of hospitality—the taking in of a stranger as a guest into one's house and accommodating him as a host—becomes an instrument for consolidating two different households, alliances and even city-states, where the power, influence and relationship of the two households are thus strengthened through the embodiment of the host's reception of the stranger and his gift to him. The hospitality of the host constitutes a demonstration of his economical, political, social and ethical views as well as his value judgments. The custom of *xenia* hence preserves the function of maintaining and consolidating the alliances and inter-city relationships between the allied Greek households of antiquity.

II. The Battlefield as Special Living Space

The *Iliad*, as the first great Greek literary work, not only depicts the story of the Trojan War of the Mycenaean Age, but also embeds an exuberant cultural significance in its war-bounded, socio-cultural context. The love and anger of the characters evolve around the customs, concepts and behavior codes that Greeks believed at that particular place and time. In his analysis of the war conflicts in the *Iliad*, Ian C. Johnston rightly points out, “[T]he *Iliad* is our first and greatest war story, and if we wish to explore the epic in any detail we have to examine carefully the central way of life it presents” (Johnston 5). To trace back and preserve a more comprehensive viewpoint and understanding of the ancient Greek life and culture portrayed in the world of the *Iliad*, it is necessary to take into careful consideration any description of the ancient life—whether it is the fights on the battleground, the scenes of war-torn families, the daily routine of the lower classes, or the most delicate and obfuscated fantasies of the noble ladies in times of wealth and prosperity.

According to Johnston, it is necessary to take the war scenes in the *Iliad* not as particular events but as frequent occurrences in daily life, so as not to miss or misjudge the important signification that these war scenes and conflicts might plan to implicate or convey, because what the *Iliad* signifies is a life philosophy that the Greeks possess at a particular time-space, whether they are at war with the Trojans or not. The combination of Greek beliefs about facing one's destiny and the Olympian gods' transient wills dominates several segments of Homer's narrative of the Trojan War. Nevertheless, Homer makes it clear that the Greek warriors do not consider this war as something particularly outside their ordinary life journey, nor beyond their traditional concept of the construction of the world:

The experience in the front line of battle is not an isolated phenomenon but an integral part of nature and, beyond that, of the metaphysical order of the universe.... The human conflict, therefore, remains always an essential part of an all-inclusive natural and cosmic drama. War does not confine itself to the clashes between the Trojans and the Akhaians; warring forces also constantly strive against each other in the natural world, and irrational oppositions govern the heavenly order of things. (Johnston 31)

Whether they are at home or abroad, the Greeks and their adventures are always a representation of their culture and worldview. The literary description of the *Iliad*, though a fictitious one, is still indicative of the nature of their daily behaviors, thoughts and philosophy.

From another perspective, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing depicts Homer's descriptive tactics as those of a painter of consequences: "Homer, I find, paints nothing but continuous actions, and all bodies, all single things, he paints only by their share in those actions, and in general only by one feature" (Lessing 24). Since many major themes in Homer's *Iliad* are abstract philosophical concepts, worldviews and cultural codes, it happens that Homer, just as Lessing correctly points out, would always make use of various descriptions of actions and bodies—all real, corporeal, and down-to-the-earth things. It is the description of the actions and bodies of the warriors in the *Iliad*, and not abstract cultural codes and philosophical concepts, that enables Homer to picture his poetic drama of life and death on the battlefield and of the violent emotion and desires that challenge the warriors' faith and valor.

Foreign battlefield or hometown territory, these are the very spaces where the Greek warriors face their fate. As the destructive results of battle are placed in the midst of a universal natural order (Johnston 35), it is the universal natural order that is given the highest priority, and the Greeks have to follow the order despite all the fatal strikes and contingencies that go contrary to their prospects. This philosophical concept is well represented in the *Iliad* as the Greek warriors fight desperately with their Trojan foes. In the war, love and hate still occupy a primary place in every warrior's mind, whether it is Agamemnon, Menelaus, Achilles, or Hector. The loss of love or friendship incites in the warriors a vengeful fury. Agamemnon, for this reason, refuses to release Chryseis to the Trojans unless Achilles gives him Briseis in her place. Thereupon, Achilles, bereft of Briseis, withdraws from the war in a huge rage.

Looking into the details of the combat that Homer describes brings us closer to the battlefield and to the warriors' love and anger. The war continues for ten years,

and Homer's narration in the *Iliad* creates more pondering spaces into which the audience may allot all the events and conflicts that transpire between the Greeks and Trojans. As the narrative goes on and more characters join in, the story lengthens to include as many details as Homer the poet considers possible. The *Iliad* becomes a narrative not just about a war, but about the Greek life style and world view:

Homer develops the sense that these battles, or ones just like them, have been going on and will go on for a long, long time, almost indefinitely. The conflicts are not discrete, unique episodes in the lives of the heroes, extraordinary events which they will someday put behind them when the campaign ends; these battles are their lives—past, present, and future. (Johnston 16)

If the warriors in the *Iliad*, who have no choice but to accept war as the condition of human existence, finally come to see their days on the battlefield as daily routine, then, the *Iliad* provides us another perspective from which to speculate on what the Greeks would possibly be doing in their ordinary lives as we study the warriors' lives and behaviors in the martial space where Olympian gods and Greek customs dominate.

Before Book 6 of the *Iliad*, Homer describes how the Greeks were having great success in the battleground even though Achilles absented himself from the fighting on account of a severe quarrel with Agamemnon concerning the distribution of the war trophy. Achilles asked Agamemnon to return Chryseis to the Trojans because her father, the priest of Apollo's shrine, sent forth an abundant ransom and requested his daughter's back. For fearing the rage of Apollo, Achilles warned Agamemnon to take the ransom and release Chryseis. However, Agamemnon would not listen to Achilles, and insisted that if he sent Chryseis home, he would take Achilles' war trophy Briseis as compensation for his lose of Chryseis. Achilles refused to take order from Agamemnon and, in a great fury, withdrew himself from further fighting.

In Book 5, though missing the great and valiant warrior Achilles on the battlefield, the Greek warriors showed no signs of weariness or retreat. They were, on the contrary, rapt with the glorious joy of defeating the Trojans by following the lead of Diomedes, the Greek hero fighting under the auspices of the goddess Athena:

Then Pallas Athena granted Tydeus' son Diomedes
Strength and daring—so the fighter would shine forth
And tower over the Argives and win himself great glory. (ll. 1-3, Book 5)¹³

¹³ All the quotations from Homer's *Iliad* in this paper are taken from *The Iliad*, translated by Robert Fagles (London: Penguin, 1998).

With the help of Athena, Diomedes fought with the Trojans fiercely and even wounded the golden Aphrodite and later, the blazing Ares as Athena instructed. Suffering the terrible slaughter and heavy casualties done by Diomedes, the Trojans were violently forced back to their city walls. In Book 6, Homer begins the narrative by describing the reaction taken by the Trojan side:

But Helenus son of Priam, best of the seers
who scan the flight of birds, came striding up
to Aeneas and Hector, calling out, “My captains!

...

Go through the ranks and rally all the troops.
Hold back our retreating mobs outside the gates
before they throw themselves in their women’s arms in fear,
a great joy to our enemies closing for the kill.
And once you’ve roused our lines to the last man,
we’ll hold out here and fight the Argives down,
hard-hit as we are—necessity drives us on. (ll. 88-101, Book 6)

Facing the fierce and undaunted Diomedes, the Trojans started to lose their valor and pride. It could only be the necessity that drove the Trojans to defend their state, their lovely wives and helpless children. However, their only chance lay in securing the protection of Athena. Helenus, a son of Priam and great seer, thus advised his brother, Hector:

But you,
Hector, you go back to the city, tell our mother
To gather all the older noble women together
In gray-eyed Athena’s shrine on the city’s crest
unlock the doors of the goddess’ sacred chamber—
and take a robe, the largest, loveliest robe
that she can find throughout the royal halls,
a gift that far and away she prizes most herself,
and spread it out across the sleek-haired goddess’ knees.¹⁴

¹⁴ It is common in the classical Greek *polis* to spread a robe to the knees of the goddess Athena as a cult practice in the temple. Powell points out that this cult practice in the temple of Athena can be dated back to the Classical Period: “The centerpiece of the Panathenaic Festival in Athens was the giving of a new robe to Athena’s statue in the Parthenon.” Powell suggests, Helenus’ description of the spreading of the robe might have other origins. Since Troy is not a Greek *polis*, he surmises that this practice was

Then promise to sacrifice twelve heifers in her shrine,
 yearlings never broken, if only she'll pity Troy,
 the Trojan wives and all our helpless children,
 if only she'll hold Diomedes back from the holy city—
 that wild spearman, that invincible headlong terror!
He is the strongest Argive now, I tell you. (ll. 101-115, Book 6)

Seeing that they were losing their battle, the Trojan prince and leader Hector was quite worried and decided to take Helenus' advice to return to the palace and find help. Following the epic description of Diomedes' invincible series of victories against the Trojans and his valiant fight with the gods in Book 5 ("Diomedes Fights the Gods"), Hector's homecoming (*nostos*, νόστος), as the main episode of Book 6, offers a spatial shift from the bloody battlefield to the private space of the Trojan palace home.

Space, as a social space of production and reproduction, according to Henri Lefebvre, reveals to us "the dialectical relationship which exists within the triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived," (Lefebvre 39) where the competence and performance of every society member and the regulations and constitutions of the society are encompassed. For Lefebvre, "(Social) space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity—their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder" (Lefebvre 73).¹⁵ It is based upon this premise that I try to interpret the spatial dispositions in this Homeric narrative as a revelation of the living space and the episodes, the theatrical performances of the Homeric society and the Greek *polis*. The spatial shift of Hector's homecoming therefore provides characteristic features of the Greek and the Trojan lives and in particular, the similarities and differences of the two cultures embedded and represented in the conceptual formations of kinship and the philosophical concept of the heroic prowess, both of which are in close relation to

based upon other Eastern sources: "But in no sense is Troy, ruled by a hereditary king, a Greek *polis*, and the giving of the robe may depend on an Eastern literary exemplar. For 2,000 years before Homer, Mesopotamians and Egyptians had paid daily attention to, and regularly changed the clothes of, statues in shrines" (Powell 2007, 60).

¹⁵ For further theoretical explications and analyses of space and the re/production of space, please see Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993), Rob Shields' *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics* (London: Routledge, 1999), Derek Gregory and John Urry, eds., *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1985), and Steve Pile's *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*. (London: Routledge, 1996).

the constitution of the code *xenia*.

Upon hearing Helenus' advice, Hector decided to return home and ask his mother Hecuba, Queen of Troy, to bring Trojan women with her to pray to Athena with abundant sacrifices so that with Athena's help, the Trojans would enjoy victory. Homer narrates Hector's homecoming with the description of his armor and countenance:

As Hector turned for home his helmet flashed
And the long dark hide of his bossed shield, the rim
Running the metal edge, drummed his neck and ankles. (Il. 135-137,
Book 6)

With these three lines Homer gives a brief description of Hector's appearance with his flashing helmet and his dark shield shimmering under the sun. However, Homer does not continue his narration about Hector's purpose of homecoming, nor Hector's encounter with his family—his father Priam, King of Troy, his mother, his brother Paris, and his sister-in-law Helen. Actually, Hector's image is left there in the first three lines without any further chance of getting into the scene and nowhere else in the epic narrative is Hector's intention further mentioned, because another episode cuts in at the end of this line, and soon occupies the center of the narrative. Not until the end of line 282, when the inserted episode is complete, does Homer once again refer back to Hector's homecoming:

And now,
when Hector reached the Scaean Gates and the great oak,
the wives and daughters of Troy came rushing up around him,
asking about their sons, brothers, friends and husbands.
But Hector told them only, "Pray to the gods"—
all the Trojan women, one after another...
Hard sorrows were hanging over many. (Il. 282-288, Book 6)

The main theme of Book 6 ("Hector Returns to Troy"), as these three lines lead the audience to anticipate, is a story about Hector and the Trojans. It is quite natural that the narrative will henceforth focus on what happened in the Trojan territory. However, quite contrary to the audience's expectation, the three-line description of Hector the Trojan hero is entirely a silhouette that disappears immediately so as to give way to the war scene outside of the Trojan walls. And not until line 282 does Hector the character return to the stage of the epic narrative. Only after the inserted episode of Diomedes and Glaucus' encounter on the battlefield is complete, can Hector once again appear at the Scaean gate of Troy to receive the anxious welcome and overwhelming inquiries of the Trojan women about their "sons, brothers, friends

and husbands.” Hector’s homecoming and his meeting with all his families, the main plot of Book 6, will then be picked up once again in the narrative: first, in the palace of Priam, Hector will meet with his father and mother, and later, Hector will confront his brother Paris and sister-in-law Helen—the couple that started the Trojan War, and finally he will have the chance to see his wife Andromache and his baby son Astyanax.

The interesting point is, immediately after the three-line introduction outlining Hector’s armor and countenance, Homer chooses to relate another story episode instead of proceeding to the tale of Hector, who has already come near the Trojan gate. As if inserting a shot of the battlefield directly into the present scene of Hector standing near the Scaean gate, Homer changes his story from the shot of the gate to Troy to that of the war and thus begins his digression into the battle scene where Diomedes and Glaucus encounter each other. This kind of narrative arrangement seems to imply that it is the war that deserves the audience’s primary attention and therefore, the epic poet’s obligation is to remind the audience that even though Hector the Trojan hero decides to leave the battlefield temporarily, the Greeks and Trojan warriors on the battlefield never stop their fighting for a minute. I would further argue that this change of perspective via the insertion of another episode into the main one significantly demonstrates the shift of the narrator’s focus and the significance of this episode to Homer the poet.

The insertion of another episode, the digression in the procession of the epic narrative, is the *punctum* that stirs the *stadium* of the structuration of Book 6, and this *punctum*, because of its peculiar narrative and spatial position, has aroused various scholastic debates and renditions. I would like to interpret its function as a tactical diversion in the process of epic narration that transforms the social and political space into a cultural context of ethics as the scene of Hector’s homecoming is replaced with the scene of the battlefield. The two places—home and battlefield—become spaces interfered, twisted, congested and transformed with this tactic narrative diversion. The martial place of the Trojan War is therefore transformed into a space of security and hospitality in preparation for the inter-household reunion of guest-friendship, and in contrast to this performative presentation of the ethical code, the palace home of Priam would consequently be turned into a space of contest in the epic narrative so as to stage properly Hector’s fraternal reproach and ethical judgment of Paris.

III. The Intrusion of the Olympian Gods and the Practice of *Xenia*

In this short but significant inserted episode, Glaucus, a Trojan ally, and Diomedes, a Greek leader, do not start fighting each other upon first acquaintance. Diomedes preserves his calmness and cleverness although he is really “burning for battle.” He does not rush to take action so as to kill the first person he meets on the scene, as other warriors would do in the same situation. He confronts his foe at the battleground, and demands first his identity:

Burning for battle, closing, squaring off
And the lord of the war cry Diomedes opened up,
“Who are you, my fine friend?—another born to die?
I’ve never noticed you on the lines where we win glory,
Not till now. But here you come, charging out
In front of all the rest with such bravado—
Daring to face the flying shadow of my spear.
Pity the ones whose sons stand up to me in war!
But if you are an immortal come from the blue,
I’m not the man to fight the gods of heaven. (ll. 140-149, Book 6)

It is not indecision that keeps Diomedes from rushing to kill his foe. In these lines he explains that he would rather verify the identity of the one he confronts than rush to fight with someone born of divine blood. With these words, Diomedes exhibits the prudence and the common sense possessed by the Greeks. Since human beings are never the rivals of the divine, it is not wise to kill whoever gets into your way. If he dares to fight with gods or acts against their advantage, he would inevitably have to face their revenge. It is men that get killed at the war, not the Olympian gods, nor their descendants. The Greeks believe that the wrath of the immortal gods is ineluctable, and that no mortal human beings could resist the fate ordained by the gods. Through Diomedes, Homer warns his audience of the frailty of man and also reminds them that any infringement one makes against the divine incurs more consequences of unimaginable misery. Through Diomedes’ mouth Homer tells the story of “Dryas’ indestructible son Lycurgus,” who “rushed at the maenads once, nurses of wild Dionysus,” and thereafter could never escape the gods’ punishment, but got his divine remuneration at the hands of Zeus:

Not even Dryas’ indestructible son Lycurgus,
Not even he lived long...

That fellow who tried to fight the deathless gods.

...

But the gods who live at ease lashed out against him—

Worse, the son of Cronus struck Lycurgus blind.

Nor did the man live long, not with the hate

Of all the gods against him. (ll. 150-164, Book 6)

This is how a mortal man is to be punished if he dares to challenge the gods. Homer's *Iliad* clearly carries the message that one should avoid agitating the gods—a message that the Greeks would always keep in mind whether they are in their own country or traveling around in foreign states. Even on the battlefield, while facing the cruelest of situations, Diomedes' words reveal vividly the common sense that the Greeks would always keep in their minds. Fighting fearlessly is heroic; however, it is never something worthy of boasting if the object of one's fury is of divine blood. Man has his place on earth, and no matter his valor must always yield to the "deathless" gods.

If Diomedes' success and self-confidence comes from the support of Zeus and Athena, the Trojan's survival of the war also depends upon the protection of Athena, as Helenus predicted. Diomedes' story of Lycurgus reminds us from another aspect of the terrible consequences of both the violation of *xenia* and the unwitting persecution of a divine being. As Ruth Scodel points out, "In the *Iliad*, divine favor does not last forever for any hero" (Scodel 84), these incidents remind us the unpredictability of the divine will. And soon we will be told that Athena, the city-goddess of Troy, refuses the prayer of the Trojan women. It is this fatal sense of the limits of human power and vulnerability that leads us back to the approval of Diomedes' restraint in fighting Glaucus immediately on the battlefield. Diomedes' demand that Glaucus identify his lineage not only justifies his restraint and moderation, but also indicates that he is the true follower of the divine advices. In Book 5, Athena thus advised Diomedes:

Look, I've lifted the mist from off your eyes

that's blurred them up to now—

so you can tell a god from man on sight.

So now if a god comes up to test your mettle,

you must not fight the immortal powers head-on,

all but one of the deathless gods, that is—

if Aphrodite daughter of Zeus slips into battle,

she's the one to stab with your sharp bronze spear! (ll. 140-147, Book 5)

Later on, when Diomedes saw Aphrodite, he did without reservation gouge her "just

where the wristbone join the palm and immortal blood came flowing quickly from the goddess” (Il. 381-389, Book 5). But when he took the chance to kill Aeneas, son of Aphrodite, who was then protected by Apollo, his valor was immediately curtailed by Apollo:

Three times he [Diomedes] charged, frenzied to bring him down,
 three times Apollo battered his gleaming shield back—
 then at Tydides’ fourth assault like something superhuman,
 the Archer who strikes from worlds away shrieked out—
 a voice of terror—“Think, Diomedes, shrink back now!
 Enough of this madness—striving with the gods.
 We are not of the same breed, we never will be,
 The deathless gods and men who walk the earth.” (Il. 502-509, Book 5)

Apollo cautioned Diomedes not to try hurting any divine beings again, for the mortals are always punished in the end for their wrong doings and violations. Diomedes abided by this admonition, which prevented him from stalking the divine beings and later, in Book 6, prevented him from violating the code of *xenia* by mistakenly killing Glaucus, the ancestral guest-friend at the battleground.

Homer’s Diomedes shows his wisdom in his obedience and respect towards the Olympian gods. As a Greek leader Diomedes must not only cultivate a strong desire to slaughter the enemy but also know how to avoid the error of agitating the gods. Afraid of the fierce consequences, Diomedes wants to prevent any offense against the gods and thus demands his opponent’s identity when confronting an enemy wearing gold armor (which might suggest to Diomedes that the owner of this gold armor might not be some ordinary human being).

This inserted episode of Diomedes and Glaucus’ encounter delivers the message that it is important not to take action or fight a war without first making sure of one’s opponent’s identity:¹⁶

No, my friend,
 I have no desire to fight the blithe immortals.

¹⁶ There is another example of infringement about what the Greek warrior did to the offspring of the gods described in Book 16, *the Iliad*. The Greek warrior Patroclus, one of the Greeks’ great warriors and the best friend of Achilles, foolishly killed the Trojan warrior Sarpedon, son of Zeus. Seeing his son’s dead body, Zeus went into a great rage and felt profound grief. For revenge, Zeus conspired to bring about Patroclus’ death, even though he was on the side of the Greeks, and was supposed to help the Greeks defeat the Trojans. Finally Zeus accomplished his plan by having the Trojan hero Hector kill Patroclus.

But if you're a man who eats the crops of the earth,
 a mortal born for death—here, come closer,
 the sooner you will meet your day to die. (Il. 164-168, Book 6)

After this exposition of his intent, Diomedes tells Glaucus the story of the king Lycurgus, who, blind to the kinship ties of the infant Dionysus to the Olympian gods, attacked him, and was later struck blind by Zeus. Hence, it is only mortals whom Diomedes would fight and send to their death. According to Diomedes' request, Glaucus tells Diomedes his genealogy—where his ancestors lived and who they were, and how they once lived in Corinth, deep in a bend of Argos, had to leave the Greek territory. It all began because King Proetus of Argos believed his queen Antea's false accusation of Glaucus' grandfather Bellerophon. Being scrupulous about the custom of *xenia*,¹⁷ the king of Argos shrank from killing Bellerophon but instead, sent him to the king of Lycia, Antea's father, to be killed. The king of Lycia, following the custom of *xenia*, gave Bellerophon a royal welcome: "Nine days he feasted him, nine oxen slaughtered. When the tenth Dawn shone with her rose-red fingers, he began to question him, asked to see his credentials, whatever he brought him from his in-law, Proteus" (Il. 206-209). However, the King of Lycia did not kill his guest-friend Bellerophon, as the folded tablet from the King of Argos requested, because such an act would be a terrible crime against *xenia* (Powell 2007, 16); so he sent him to kill Chimera, which task Bellerophon completed successfully. Finally, after Bellerophon passed one task after another, subsequently fighting the Solymi, bringing the Amazons down and killing the best men from Lycia whom the King had sent to ambush him, the king of Lycia "could see the man's power at last," and gave Bellerophon his own daughter's hand in marriage. Bellerophon, for all the ill treatment at the hands of the King of Argos and the difficult tasks the king of Lycia assigned him, was favored by the divine beings, and his daughter Laodamia even bore Zeus a son, Sarpedon. But, as it turned out for Glaucus, all of a sudden

17 King Proetus of Argos was told by his queen Antea that Bellerophon lusted for her. But he "could not kill his guest, as he fully deserved, without violating the sacred customs of *xenia*," so he sent Bellerophon "to the queen's father in Lycia bearing the famous folded tablet with 'baneful signs.'" (Powell 2007, 114) Although in a rage, King Proetus of Argos decided not to kill Bellerophon immediately. He managed to avoid violating the custom of *xenia* by sending Bellerophon carrying the folded tablet which contained his alleged crime to the king of Lycia and thus planned to have the king of Lycia kill Bellerophon. However, the situation repeated itself again in the court of the king of Lycia, for the king of Lycia cannot kill his stranger-guest Bellerophon without violating the code of *xenia*. It is the code of *xenia* that twice saves the life of Bellerophon. Both the stories of King Proetus of Argos and the king of Lycia echoed the theme of *xenia*.

Bellerophon lost the favors of the Olympian gods, and his son Isander was killed by the War-god Ares, and his daughter Laodamia was cut down by Artemis. Only one of his offspring was left alive, and this Hippolochus later gave birth to Glaucus and now sent him off to Troy, to live up to the family's reputation.

When Glaucus answered Diomedes' challenge and demand of his identity, he did not reveal his genealogy directly but gave a brief lament of the fate of mortal beings:

High-hearted son of Tydeus, why ask about my birth?
Like the generations of leaves, the lives of mortal men.
Now the wind scatters the old leaves across the earth,
now the living timber bursts with the new buds
and spring comes round again. And so with men:
as one generation comes to life, another dies away. (Il. 170-175, Book 6)

By comparing human lives to leaves, Glaucus made it clear that life and death were but natural cycles as generations of new leaves replaced the old withered ones, so a man's identity and life were not much worthy of a mention when one was faced with a formidable warrior who was under divine favor and enjoyed a triumphant career on the battlefield. Following this philosophical understanding of the brevity of human life, Glaucus' account of his genealogy reiterated the same theme by emphasizing human vulnerability and the unpredictability of life, as Bellerophon's story laid bare to us. These two factors, however, can be more or less related to the previous story told by Diomedes about the infant Dionysus and Lycurgus. Both Diomedes' story and Glaucus' account of his lineage touch upon the themes of mortal vulnerability and the unpredictability of divine favor. The frailty of the mortal race forces men to depend upon the institution of *xenia*. When Bellerophon was sent to Lycia to be killed, the code of *xenia* protected him from any immediate execution in King Lycia's court. The unpredictability of divine favor becomes all the more clear when Bellerophon's offspring suddenly was killed and he himself became "a fugitive on the run from the beaten tracks of men." Reading this episode as a rendition of the ancient tie of guest-friendship, Stephen Fineberg concludes, "Families and communities, including the larger community defined by the institution of guest-friendship (ξενία), are grounded in the recognition of individual vulnerability" (Fineberg 17). However, Diomedes' story also touches upon the issues of mortal vulnerability and the punishment of any failure to practice *xenia*. King Lycurgus' mad attack on the infant Dionysus and his violation of the code of *xenia* outrages Zeus, both father to Dionysus and the protector of *xenia*. Lycurgus' story teaches Diomedes a lesson of prudence and restraint. It is through the understanding of mortal frailty that the Greek institution of *xenia* becomes

significant, especially with the rise of the *polis*.

After knowing Glaucus' genealogy, instead of declaring war on Glaucus, Diomedes immediately stops his war cry and throws off his spear to welcome Glaucus. Here once again the inserted episode brings forth surprise—surprise that this encounter that seemed to be leading to a possible violent and bloody war scene should suddenly change into a friendly hand-shaking one. Homer's narration emphasizes Diomedes's re-action to Glaucus' family genealogy. Diomedes immediately throws his spear to the ground to indicate his withdrawal from the fight: "Raising his spear, the lord of the war cry drove it home, planting it deep down in the earth that feeds us all," and thus, the following lines echo with a spirit of geniality as Diomedes happily declares his feelings of finding an old family friend on the battlefield:

and with winning words he called out to Glaucus,
the young captain, "Splendid—you are my friend,
my guest from the days of our grandfathers long ago!
Noble Oeneus hosted your brave Bellerophon once,
He held him in his halls, twenty whole days,
And they gave each other handsome gifts of friendship.
My kinsman offered a gleaming sword-belt, rich red,
Bellerophon gave a cup, two-handed, solid gold—
I left it at home when I set out for Troy. (ll. 256-264, Book 6)

Diomedes emphasizes that he never for one day forgot the dear friendship that his grandfather Oeneus set up with the strange traveler Bellerophon, the grandfather of Glaucus. Diomedes assures Glaucus that Oeneus and Bellerophon once exchanged precious gifts and thus established ties of friendship between the two households and that such an ancestral guest-friendship between the two families should by no means be forgotten by later progeny. Although because of the war he had to leave home without carrying with him the gift cup Bellerophon gave to his grandfather, he assures Glaucus that the relationship and friendship between the two households will not be changed, even in wartime and with the two families belonging to two different alliances:

So now I am your host and friend in the heart of Argos,
you are mine in Lycia when I visit in your country.
Come, let us keep clear of each other's spears,
even there in the thick of battle (ll. 268-271, Book 6)

Hence, even there in "the thick of battle," Diomedes claims his loyalty to the family guest-friendship. And just as their ancestors did so many years ago, he proposes to

Glaucus that they exchange something with which to commemorate and further prolong this relationship:

Look,
Plenty of Trojans there for me to kill,
Your famous allies too, any soldier the god
Will bring in range or I can run to ground.
And plenty of Argives too—kill them if you can.
But let's trade armor. The men must know our claim:
We are sworn friends from our fathers' days till now! (ll. 271-277,
Book 6)

As Diomedes' words clearly suggest, that the family guest-friendship be reclaimed and reconfirmed is more important than killing an enemy on the battlefield. To Diomedes, they each could kill as many enemies in the opposite alliance as possible; however, they are friends and what makes their friendship even more precious and admirable is that this relationship started from their grandfathers' days and that it is based upon the custom of *xenia*.

This episode of the meeting of Diomedes and Glaucus is described with a simple and direct dialogue style, inserted within the Homeric narrative of emotive and impressive poetic description of Hector's homecoming and his meeting with all the family members. The episode inserted into the main story of Hector's homecoming is quite odd and intrusive, for it starts when Homer has just given a three-line description of Hector's helmet. However, besides its intrusiveness, this insertion plays a very tricky role in its signifying process. Digressions and insertions, while from a certain angle might carry insinuating extra information or add out-of-the-scene messages to the main text, do not commonly have an important role in usual narrative plots. Nevertheless, in Book 6 of the *Iliad*, this inserted episode plays an important role in the overall textual design.

IV. Battlefield vs. Home

Book 6 begins with the inserted episode where a Greek custom *xenia* is respected and later the epic narrative returns to the main episode where the violation of this very cultural code is remembered and reproached. The significant duplication circling around the Greek custom of *xenia* connects the two episodes—the inserted digression of the resuming of guest-friendship on the battlefield and the reproach of the violation of *xenia* Hector later hints to Paris in his homecoming, which reminds us all, in turn, of the cause of the Trojan War. The teaching of the custom is thus first initiated by the practicing of respect of *xenia* on the battlefield and later,

reinforced through Hector's reprimand of Paris's disrespect of *xenia* causing the war. The recognition of the meaning and custom of *xenia* is practiced both on the battleground and at home. The two spaces portrayed by Homer in Book 6 of *the Iliad* make for a great contrast as the narrative proceeds. On the one hand, the juxtaposition of these two spaces—the battlefield and the palace home—lays emphasis on the conflicts and predicaments of human beings' inescapable fatal conditions and their optimistic hopes of their progeny's being well received at foreign lands through the progenitor's warm hospitality towards strangers and travelers, while on the other hand, it is emphasized that the insolent foreigner who disregards the religious and cultural code of *xenia* will not easily escape punishment from both men and gods. The violation of such a code of conduct will bring forth misfortunes beyond imagination. In this case, Paris's violation of *xenia* turns out to be a bad omen that leads to an inter-city/international war that lasts for ten years, causing much devastation.

Homer's narrative design helps make a subtle comparison and contrast of the two episodes through the characters' reaction to the custom code in the narrative. On the battlefield where Diomedes and Glaucus meet, *xenia* is treated as the highest code that both Diomedes and Glaucus pay their respects to in spite of their facing the most crucial circumstances of fighting for their life and glory in war. When compared with the glory and honor in defeating the enemy in war, the custom of *xenia* is always the highest guidelines that the Greeks should abide by, no matter whether they are at home or on the battleground. Diomedes and Glaucus are obliged to make peace with each other and show their respect to the Greek custom instead of fighting each other to the death. Refusing to fight is what their ancestral guest-friendship demands them to do. It is a kind of protection and safety that *xenia*, in quite a strange way, preserves them as their ancestors hoped. However, Paris, as a foreigner, daringly seducing his host's wife Helen and taking her out of Menelaus's palace, violated the cultural code.

The battlefield is ordinarily quite a special space and place that demands principles and regulations of the *polis*, but when the war lengthens year after year and the combat between the Greeks and the Trojans and all their allies consume more and more young and courageous warriors, it can no longer be treated as a particular political space that is merely under the sovereignty of the *polis*. The demands of the warriors' loyalty to the city-state and their sacrifice of their lives for the supreme goal of the *polis* are supposed to be the guidelines and main concern the warriors should bear in mind; however, during the long war, the special battlefield gradually turns out to be the space and place where the political is no longer supreme and is forced to reside with the social and the cultural. If fighting to gain victory is the utmost goal of a Greek warrior who wants to show his competence and

excellence in combat, and to lose his life is but a possible situation that he must not take into consideration as the pride and honor of a warrior forbids him to, then, the performance of *xenia* to an enemy on the battlefield in Book 6 of the *Iliad* would be a good episode and also a starting point for us to meditate upon the possibility of the transformation of space and also, the indication of the mixture of the rigid principles of the *polis* with the code of *xenia* that guarantees the broad-minded love and guest-friendship required by cultural and social conventions. The battleground is thus taken as the extended social-cultural territory of the city-state. What is respected and abided by at home is to be respected and performed in the martial space, and this is the ethical concept that the two Homeric episodes reveal to its reader.

After this inserted episode, Homer's narrative returns once again to Hector and his father Priam's palace home. The happy reconciliation of Diomedes and Glaucus on the battlefield is thus replaced by the description of Hector's determination to go home. It merits mentioning here that "homecoming" (*nostos*, νόστος) is a frequent theme in Homeric epics. "Homecoming," as a theme for the later understanding of the Greek and Homeric concept of the divine unpredictability and the human predicaments and vulnerability, is particularly emphasized and analyzed, especially when scholars study the famous long and adventurous wandering of Odysseus's homecoming to Ithaca, where the palace hall was occupied by the many suitors of his beautiful wife Penelope. Odysseus's homecoming finally proves to be a test of valor and wits, of the mutual trust between the father and son, Telemachus, in the fight(ing) with the suitors and of the profound yet secured love between man and his wife after ten years' separation.

However, in the *Iliad*, *nostos* is not always treated as a positive term. While the war goes on, homecoming implies shame and disgrace to the Greek warriors.¹⁸ When Achilles was raging against Agamemnon's rule and biased distribution of the

18 Karen Bassi notes that in the *Odyssey*, the significance of *nostos*, homecoming, is expressed as a deferred desire. Odysseus's desire for *nostos* "means not simply a return to the hero's homeland but a return to his own palace and immediate family, that is, to domestic life" (Bassi 416). After ten years of the Trojan War and the following years wandering at sea, Odysseus's desire of *nostos* reveals the significance of what the domestic life represents in contrast to the fights in a war and the wanderings at sea. But in the *Iliad*, returning home, not only for Achilles but also for Agamemnon and Thersites, is a threat. Bassi contends, "However various the reasons for the threat, in each case it signals the possibility of a Greek withdrawal and defeat; *nostos* in the *Iliad* means a premature end of battle and of the narrative itself.... In short, going home in the *Iliad* is the antithesis of martial combat as the vehicle of heroic virtue" (Bassi 417).

trophy, his refusal to go to the battlefield and his thought of going home as a refuge was criticized as bringing shame to his name as a warrior and to his father's household. However, the narrative of Hector's homecoming¹⁹ is significant for its revelation of the ethics of morality and the reconsideration of *xenia* at various levels. I would like to relate Hector's homecoming to the theme of *xenia*, in respect of the Homeric design that embeds the Diomedes-Glaucus meeting as the intrusive material—the *punctum*. I would place it onto a larger textual plan of Homeric themes of mortal vulnerability and divine unpredictability, which makes the textural framework of the epic an on-going process of re-mapping and re-constructing the code of *xenia* in various different spaces and places.

Back at the palace, Hector tries to push Paris to fight for the Trojans. Homer gives Hector the voice of justice to criticize Paris's hiding behind the walls:

Seeing Paris,
Hector raked his brother with insults, stinging taunts:
“What on earth are you doing? Oh how wrong it is,

¹⁹ In Book 24, the *Iliad*, there is a divine arrangement letting Priam, the king of Troy, (to) make supplication to Achilles so as to bring Hector's corpse back to Troy—the second homecoming, and the last for Hector. Under the escort of Hermes, Priam reached Achilles' tent and he took Hermes' advice to supplicate to Achilles: “clasp Achilles' knees, implore him by his father, his mother with lovely hair, by his own son—so you can stir his heart” (ll. 546-548, Book 24). Achilles showed sympathy to his late night intruder/guest Priam as he, kneeling down beside him, clasped his knees and kissed his hands, pleading: “Revere the gods, Achilles! Pity me in my own right, remember your own father! I deserve more pity.” We are told, “Those words stirred within Achilles a deep desire to grieve for his own father” (ll. 588-593, Book 24). Achilles wept and thought of his own father and finally acceded to let Priam take back Hector's corpse so as to hold a funeral in Troy. In this episode, there is a minor description related to the code of *xenia*. After Achilles granted Priam the return of Hector's corpse, and persuaded him to take some food and wine, the exhausted and weary old king of Troy further asked the favor to sleep in Achilles' tent for that one night. Achilles, based upon the code of hospitality towards strangers, took Priam in his tent, provided food and wine to his guest, and, as Priam asked for the bed, once again, he had his men and servants make beds and let Priam sleep under the porch. According to Michael Lloyd, “in Homeric society it is entirely normal for guests to sleep outside under the colonnade while the host sleeps inside.... This arrangement represents in spatial terms the intermediate status of the guest between insider and outsider. The significant distinction is between those who are part of the household and those who are not, rather than between different categories of guest” (Lloyd 76). As a stranger/guest to Achilles' tent, Priam received Achilles' hospitality to stay and sleep at the porch even though the Greeks and the Trojans were at war with each other outside.

this anger you keep smoldering in your heart! Look,
 your people dying around the city, the steep walls,
 dying in arms—and all for you, the battle cries
 and the fighting flaring up around the citadel.
 You'd be the first to lash out at another—anywhere—
 You saw hanging back from this, this hateful war.

Up with you—

Before all Troy is torched to a cinder here and now!" (ll. 382-391,
 Book 6)

Facing his exhausted warrior brother Hector, Paris, in his own sumptuous home, receives harsh judgment from Hector, and also from Homer's audience. It is because of Helen that the Greeks sailed all the way to fight Troy. Helen's elopement with Paris while Paris was hosted by Menelaus gave Menelaus and Agamemnon the cause to recruit all the Greek warriors to fight the Trojans and bring back Helen. This is an insult that the Greeks would not endure. This kind of insult would definitely provoke the Greeks' fury and their strong demand of justice. They would plead with Zeus *Xenios* to impose fierce punishment on the violators. For example, in *Agamemnon*, the first play of Aeschylus' trilogy the *Oresteia*, the chorus, representing the old men of Argos, in their ten-year long and anxious waiting for the return of the Greek warriors, desperately invoked Zeus, the protector of *xenia*, and the Fury to punish Paris:

Yet someone hears on high...and drives at the outlaws, late
 but true to revenge, a stabbing Fury!
 So towering Zeus the god of guests
 drives Atreus' sons at Paris,
 all for a woman manned by many
 the generations wrestle, knees
 grinding the dust, the manhood drains,
 the spear snaps in the first blood rites
 that marry Greece and Troy. (ll. 61-72)²⁰

The chorus, standing for the sagacious elders of the city, while examining and lamenting the desperate result Helen and Paris's elopement brought to them and their allies, gave out their cry of woe and pleaded with Zeus to punish Paris because

²⁰ The quotations from the *Oresteia: Agamemnon* are translated by Robert Fagles, from the *Norton Anthology of Western Literature*, 8th edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.

of his contempt and violation of the cultural code:

I adore you, iron Zeus of the guest
and your revenge—you drew your longbow
year by year to a taut full draw
till one bolt, not falling short
or arching over the stars,
could split the mark of Paris! (Il. 365-370)

The code of *xenia* is highly respected by the Greeks and the violation of it cannot be easily forgiven; so the chorus continuously emphasized and insisted the punishment of Paris and the justice be done to the Greeks: “So Paris learned:/ he came to Atreus’ house/ and shamed the tables spread for guests,/ he stole away the queen” (Il.399-402). The chorus not only sang out the theme of revenge that carried the Greek allies to fight Troy and to retrieve back their Helen but also reiterated the important theme of revenge on the violation of *xenia*, which deserved great attendance and respect as the very true code of ethics that the Greeks abided by and through which they established and consolidated alliances and mutual obligation.

Moreover, they would demonstrate their respect and obedience to the cultural code of *xenia* by teaching the barbarian Trojans a cultural lesson. Paris’s violation of *xenia* directly becomes the pretext of the Trojan War. However, even though the war was caused by his insolent deeds, Paris would still prefer to hide in the palace instead of trying to amend what his violation of *xenia* brought forth. He refuses to go out heroically and valorously to the battlefield and fight the Greeks. Paris’s hiding with Helen in the palace only proves to Hector that he is selfish and irresponsible, while Hector’s mention of Helen’s elopement and Paris’s violation of *xenia* once again reminds Homer’s audience of the previous inserted episode where two opponents, valuing *xenia* above all, rekindle their family guest-friendship by exchanging war gear. The consequences of Paris’s misdeeds lead to war and send many Trojans to their death; however, the hospitality that Oeneus gave to Bellerophon paved the way for Diomedes and Glaucus’ guest-friendship on the battleground.

With this understanding the insertion of the battlefield episode becomes a sharp reminder of and also a contrast to Paris’s wrongdoing. The function of the episode of gift exchanging and guest-friendship reclaiming at the battleground is made clear. It implicitly highlights the consequence of Paris’s violation of the cultural custom *xenia* and moreover, places this violation as the cause of the germination of the Trojan War. Besides these effects, there is another function that aims at another level—the challenge and reclamation of honor and ethics as the basis of aristocratic institution. Paris’s shamelessness would be the core of this concern. What is laid

bare to the Greek audience of the *Iliad* is that Paris the sly man would rather hide behind the high palace walls than go to the battlefield, even after committing a terrible violation and inducing the terrible war, and thus brings great pains and even death(s) to his people. As Michael Silk points out clearly, Greek culture is not a culture of guilt, but a culture of shame. What Paris's selfish deeds demonstrate in securing his own safety by hiding in the room, as well as in his shameless answer to his brother Hector's reproach and urge, could only further alert the audience to what kind of characteristics Paris is supposed to stand for. And if "there is the individualist ethic to which the aristocratic heroes subscribe," and that "their concern for personal honour (*timē*) and their competitive ambition 'always to be best'" is to be taken at face value (Silk 29), then, Paris is the worst example for the Greek audience that listen to the *Iliad*—the story of Trojan War—at a time when it was long past its political and military consequences, and yet another phase of morality and ethics was to begin.

The fact that Paris values his personal happiness and life more than anything else and paid not the slightest respect to the cultural code of the host family while he was a guest to Menelaus might incur quite a feeling of distaste from the audience, and his not caring about the other Trojans who have to fight for him and his wrongdoings would further enrage the Greek audience who would never give their respect to their own warriors and aristocrats if they behaved like that. However, it is also important to note that trying to impose the Greek ethics on the Trojans might be improper, if the Trojans have no such religious and cultural code of ethics themselves.²¹ However, Paris's violation of the ethical code of *xenia* and his neglect of the importance of preserving the inter-city relationship cannot be easily passed over as mere outgrowth of his ignorance of inter-city cultural difference.

With the inserted narrative of the recognition of an old family relationship based upon *xenia* and the following peace-making deeds of Diomedes and Glaucus, Homer strongly impresses upon his audience how a host's hospitality towards a strange traveler and the traveler's reciprocal respect of *xenia* would later bring peace to the (later) progeny of both. The violation of *xenia*, however, as in Paris's case, not only demonstrates to the Greek audience that the foreigner Paris's disobedience of

21 While analyzing the poetics of supplication in the *Odyssey*, Kevin Crotty points out that it is important to beware of "an unwarranted importing of one culture's ethics into another realm, where such ethics can have no meaning," (Crotty 146) and also, to discern how the significance of a ceremony would affect those who involve in it, because "a ceremony like supplication—or hospitality, to which supplication is closely allied—draws its meaning on any given occasion from the specific purposes of those invoking it" (Crotty 200).

the cultural code would finally bring him his miserable end, but also brings the audience the satisfaction of knowing that Greeks do possess a higher and more profound culture than that of their neighbors. Without similar insight and wisdom for the future, the foreign countries would not receive the gods' protection nor are their progeny's prosperity and safety guaranteed.

Quite contrary to Paris's indifference, the Greeks are portrayed by Homer as a people whose high culture and wisdom teach them to behave and act sagaciously, and even when the Greeks have to fight in war, they still try their best to obey their esteemed cultural codes. Glaucus, whose ancestors were also from the reign of the Greeks, though fighting with the Trojans as an ally, keeps the custom of *xenia*. Diomedes, though facing his enemy, places the respect of a family friend higher than the killing of an enemy.

By exchanging their armor, Diomedes and Glaucus make a demonstration of their friendship, whose history dates back to their grandfathers. As compensation is the way the Greek men show and enact their "familial and homosocial solidarity and at the same time negotiate hierarchy in relation to one another" (Wilson 29), the exchange of armor on the battlefield demonstrates the two warriors' oath of a treasured guest-friendship and their respect and obedience towards the Greek custom, *xenia*. The tribal relationship and guest-friendship are to be consolidated both within the society and without. Compensation is the social glue between men, and *xenia* extends the goodwill of the host to the stranger-traveler and builds up a relationship and friendship beyond the tribal territory. It looks forward to establish a distant friendship and connection to the possible foreign territories that the host and his progeny might one day visit. As aristocrats and honorable warriors, Diomedes and Glaucus demonstrate their obedience to *xenia*; for them, the institution of guest-friendship is to be valued above all other codes, and therefore, though they are only the descendants of the guest-friendship, they refuse to fight one another. With their armor exchanged, the status of the relationship between Diomedes and Glaucus is thus fixed and strengthened. Through the exchange of hospitality and gifts, the aristocrat warriors declare their relationship—"the beneficiary gains honour, the benefactor gains the other's future support" (Silk 29).

While analyzing the *polis* as an institution of supreme power ruling over an individual, Michael Davis suggests, "The Trojan War means the death of the dual meaning of *xenos*. After the theft of Helen, strangers must cease to be guest-friends and become enemies" (Davis 159). The feeling of enmity is supposed to be the only emotion that the Greek warriors should possess when they fight with their Trojan enemies. However, the reunion of Diomedes and Glaucus and their exchange of gifts reverse the proper feelings of hostility and enmity on the battlefield. Their recognition of each other proclaims the reestablishment of an old guest-friendship

and the re-connected alliance of two families. Here, the risk of betraying one's alliance is undoubtedly present and it is obvious that the favor given to the stranger guest-friend surpasses one's promise to assist and support one's friends and allies. As Diomedes exchanges his armor with Glaucus', he expresses his respect to the code of *xenia* and obeys the cultural convention of extending the old family tie of hospitality towards the guest-friend even though they are on the battlefield and supposed to be enemies. In spite of his fighting the Trojan War for the honor of the Greeks, Diomedes cherishes his enemy friend Glaucus and ignores the distinction between enemy and friend. Then, with their exchange of gifts, the order of the Greek *polis* is transgressed and the distinction between the enemy and friend becomes vague.

However, what lies behind this ambiguity is the code of *xenia*. To extend their friendship to the stranger-guests and to invite them to their house as hosts is the Greek way of hospitality towards strangers. The *Iliad*, showing the restoration of ancestral guest-friendship on the battlefield, posits a possible conflict between *xenia* and *polis*. The conflict between the political and the cultural is expressed in the conflict between the distinction of enemy and friend. Diomedes should act the valiant warrior and fight his enemy to the death; however, he chooses to stand by the cultural code and stick to his family tie of guest-friendship. The *Iliad* makes it clear that *xenia* enjoys a priority over *polis*. As far as the individual is concerned, Diomedes' and Glaucus' identification and reclamation of their ancestral guest-friendship save them from a bloody fight on the battlefield. On the literary level, such a recognition and respect of *xenia* is worthy of a digression inserted into the description of Hector's homecoming. The religious, cultural, political and economic significances of *xenia* are thus represented in the respect paid to the ethical code of *xenia* in the battlefield. It is the function of the inserted episode as *punctum* that makes clear the comparison between the Greeks and the Trojans as their ethical regulations are concerned. In this inserted episode, the battlefield is changed into the field of reunion. The public battleground is turned into a domestic sphere. The re-establishment of the family guest-friendship is more important than fighting and killing the enemy. Even belonging to two separate camps at war would not deter Diomedes and Glaucus from shaking hands and exchanging armors. The world of war and bloodshed then transforms into a social world of customs and hospitality. The battlefield of Homer thus becomes the social space where the Greek warriors have their daily behaviors, beliefs, and customs expressed as if they were still acting and behaving normally in the days of peace:

Both agreed. Both fighters sprang from their chariots,
Clasped each other's hands and traded pacts of friendship.
But the son of Cronus, Zeus, stole Glaucus' wits away.
He traded his gold armor for bronze with Diomedes,
The worth of a hundred oxen just for nine. (Il. 278-282, Book 6)

To amuse his Greek audience, Homer ends the inserted episode with the unequal exchange of gifts: the Trojan ally Glaucus loses his wits by Zeus²² and exchanges his gold armor for the bronze one Diomedes has, for the Greek warrior Diomedes is under the auspice of Zeus *Xenios* to gain both from his recognition of a guest-friend and also from the exchange of gifts.²³ The reward Diomedes obtained once again reassures the Greek audience that whether it is war or peace, *xenia* is never to be forgotten nor violated. Homer's *Iliad*, through its devotion of part of its volume to the description (and insertion) of how *xenia* is practiced and respected while the war is going on thickly and violently, gives to this underlying cultural code a lasting significance and a glamour to be emulated.

22 M. I. Finley points out that in the Hellenic world, "Guest-friendship was a very serious institution, the alternative to marriage in forging bonds between rulers; and there could have been no more dramatic test of its value in holding the network of relationships together than just such a critical moment. Guest-friend and guest-friendship were far more than sentimental terms of human affection. In the world of Odysseus they were technical names for very concrete relationships, as formal and as evocative of rights and duties as marriage. And they remained so well thereafter" (Finley 115). Just like the case of arranging marriages, men tried to enter an alliance to create the possibility for two communities, the establishment of guest-friendship was very important in securing and requesting new lines of kin and of mutual obligation: "Only men arranged marriages, only a man from whom Zeus had taken the wits would have neglected considerations of wealth, power, and support in making his selection," and thus, for the sake of upholding *xenia*, Glaucus went witless and gave out his gold armor to renew the ancestral guest-friendship.

23 Reading the first few lines of Glaucus' account about the brevity of human life (Il. 170-175, Book 6), J. D. Craig contends that Glaucus knew very well who Diomedes was, and thus was aware of his inferior situation: "It must have occurred to Glaucus, faced with the formidable Diomedes, that his own hour might have come, that his own share of brief life was at stake" (Craig 243). It is this fatal understanding that Glaucus knew that Diomedes' challenge is "as good as an invitation to fight and be killed," and would finally exchange his gold armor for bronze as a consolidation of the renewal of *xenia* and "avoid each other in the future fighting" (Craig 244). Walter Donlan points out that "Glaucus did overgive intentionally, but ... Diomedes, not he, was the superior in status" (Donlan 3). Glaucus gave out a larger gift, but that might be "easily interpreted as a gift of submission" (Donlan 12). Byron Harries suggests that one reason for Glaucus being induced to hand over gold for bronze is "the need to sustain the parallel with his grandfather's offering the gold cup to Oeneus in exchange for a leather belt" (Harries 142-143). However, since giving gift is a mark of respect and affection and also, a symbol for the establishment of *xenia*, both Bellerophon's and Glaucus' gift-giving imply that they view the other as more valuable or they hold the other in higher esteem.

Works Cited

- Aeschylus. *The Oresteia: Agamemnon*. Trans. Robert Fagles. *The Norton Anthology of Western Literature*. 8th ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- Alden, Maureen. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1991.
- Bassi, Karen. "Nostos, Domos, and the Architecture of the Ancient Stage." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 98.3 (1999): 415-449.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Homer: Bloom's Major Poets*. Broomall: Chelsea, 2001.
- Bowra, C. M. *Homer*. Bath: Pitman, 1979.
- Cairns, Douglas L., ed. *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Craig, J. D. "XPYΣEA XAAKEIQN." *The Classical Review* 17.3 (1967): 243-245.
- Crotty, Kevin. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.
- Davis, Michael. "Politics and Madness." *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*. Ed. J. Peter Euben. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 142-161.
- Donlan, Walter. "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy." *Phoenix* 43.1 (1989): 1-15.
- Euben, J. Peter, ed. *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- Fineberg, Stephen. "Blind Rage and Eccentric Vision in *Iliad* 6." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999): 13-41.
- Finley, M. I. *The World of Odysseus*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1962.
- Fowler, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Gaisser, Julia Haig. "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaucus-Diomedes Episode." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100 (1969): 165-176.
- Gregory, Derek and John Urry, eds. *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. Hampshire: Macmillan, 1985.
- Griffin, Jasper. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

- Harries, Byron. "'Strange Meeting': Diomedes and Glaucus in *Iliad* 6." *Greece & Rome* 40.2 (1993): 133-146.
- Homer. *The Iliad*. Trans. Robert Fagles. London: Penguin, 1998.
- Johnston, Ian C. *The Ironies of War: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Lanham: UP of America, Inc., 1988.
- Katz, Marilyn A. "Homecoming and Hospitality: Recognition and the Construction of Identity in the *Odyssey*." *Epic and Epoch: Essays on the Interpretation and History of a Genre*. Eds. Steven M. Oberhelman, Van Kelly and Richard J. Golsan. Lubbock: Texas Tech UP, 1994. 49-75.
- Latacz, Joachim. *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery*. Trans. Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Lawall, Sarah, William G. Thalmann, Lee Patterson, Heather James, Patricia Meyer Spacks, eds. *The Norton Anthology of Western Literature*. 8th ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraïm. "Gotthold Ephraïm Lessing on Ekphrasis and Helen of Troy." *Homer*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Broomall: Chelsea House, 2001. 24-26.
- Lloyd, Michael. "The Politeness of Achilles: Off-Record Conversation Strategies in Homer and the Meaning of 'Kertomia'." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 124 (2004): 75-89.
- Luce, J. V. *Celebrating Homer's Landscapes: Troy and Ithaca Revisited*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Morris, Ian. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*. Ed. Douglas L. Cairns. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. 57-91.
- Oberhelman, Steven M., Van Kelly and Richard J. Golsan, eds. *Epic and Epoch: Essays on the Interpretation and History of a Genre*. Lubbock: Texas Tech UP, 1994.
- Osborne, Robin. "Homer's Society." *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Ed. Robert Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 206-219.
- Pile, Steve. *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Powell, Barry B. *Classical Myth*. 2nd. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- Powell, Barry B. *Homer*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Scodel, Ruth. "The Wits of Glaucus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 122 (1992): 73-84.

-
- Shields, Rob. *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Silk, Michael. *Homer: The Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Vivante, Paolo. *The Homeric Imagination: A Study of Homer's Poetic Perception of Reality*. New York: Irvington, 1983.
- Wilson, Donna F. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Wood, Michael. *In Search of the Trojan War*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1998.

特洛伊戰場上的情誼

——史詩《伊里亞德》中的賓主之誼

蔡 秀 枝*

摘 要

本文主要是在探討古希臘時期存在於兩個異邦家族間的賓主之誼 (*xenia*, *guest-friendship*)，如何在荷馬史詩《伊里亞德》(*the Iliad*)的戰場中呈現為希臘生活哲學中的基本倫理規範。賓主之誼乃是出門在外的希臘旅人於他鄉異地時，與留宿並盛情款待他的他鄉知遇主人發展出家族間的賓主情誼，而這樣的情誼也是古希臘人用以鞏固家族與城邦間同盟關係的方法。本文將以《伊里亞德》第六章裏，戴奧米迪斯 (*Diomedes*) 與葛勞可斯 (*Glaukus*) 這兩位互相敵對的驍勇主將如何在戰場中確認其祖父輩們之間曾建立起的賓主之誼，因而握手言歡，互贈禮物為起始，探討荷馬史詩《伊里亞德》第六章的敘事如何將戰場空間轉化為社會空間，並且在此轉換的空間中，藉由對賓主之誼這個倫理規範的闡述與演繹，生產並強化倫理與宗教、文化、政治間的互相關聯。

關鍵詞：荷馬 伊里亞德 賓主之誼 城邦 社會空間

* 臺灣大學外國語文學系副教授