

University of Tartu
Department of Semiotics

Aubrey Armbruster

TRANSLATIONS OF *MENIS*
IN 21ST CENTURY LITERARY ADAPTATIONS OF THE
ILIAD

Master Thesis

Supervisor: Elin Sütiste, Ph.D.

Tartu

2016

I hereby declare that I have written the Master Thesis myself, independently. All of the other authors' texts, main viewpoints, and data from other resources have been referred to.

Author: Aubrey Armbruster

(signature)

.....

(date)

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
0.1 Foreword	4
0.2 Research Questions, Aims & Goals	4
0.3 Methodology	5
0.4 Historiography	6
0.5 Materials & Scope	6
0.6 Source text introduction	9
1. ADAPTATION	12
1.1 Metatext	12
1.2 Cultural recoding	14
1.3 Typology of transformation operations	16
1.4 Realia	19
2. THE MOTIF OF <i>MENIS</i>	22
2.1 Definition and explanation of <i>menis</i>	22
2.2 <i>Menis</i> as realia	24
2.2.1 Other realia in source text	25
3. TRANSLATION OF CAUSES	30
3.1 Transformations of dishonor	30
3.1.1 Deletion and repetition of dishonor of authority of the gods	30
3.1.2 Repetition and substitution of dishonor of authority of men	31
3.2.1 Substitution and addition of violation of <i>xenia</i>	32
3.2.2 Substitution of dishonor with humiliation/emotional-psychological pain	33
3.2 Repetition of grief	34
3.3 Addition of violation of bodily autonomy	35
4. TRANSLATION OF MANIFESTATIONS	37
4.1 Nature / the gods	37
4.1.1 Deletion and repetition of water manifestations	38
4.1.2 Repetition of fire manifestations	40
4.1.3 Repetition and deletion of pestilence	42
4.2 Repetition of mutilation and body desecration	44
4.2.1 Repetition of death and desecration of Hector	44
4.2.2 Addition of eye mutilation	46
4.2.3 Repetition, addition, and deletion of human sacrifice and cannibalism	47
4.3 Inaction	49
4.3.1 Repetition of the embassy to Achilles	51
5. TRANSLATIONS OF APPEASEMENT	52
5.1 Repetition of yielding to greater <i>menis</i>	52
5.2 Repetition of appeasement through pity and empathy	53
5.3 Repetition and deletion of ritual	53
5.3.1 Repetition of sharing of meal between Achilles and Priam	54

5.3.2 Deletion of funerary rites of Hector	55
5.4 Substitution in reestablishment of “balance” / “equivalency”	56
6. MODEL OF TARGET TEXTS	58
6.1 Overall pattern(s) of transformations	58
6.2 Repetition and substitution of self-contained models of <i>menis</i> within the texts	59
6.3 Addition of reactions to <i>menis</i> as translations of <i>menis</i>	62
CONCLUSION	65
REFERENCES	67
APPENDICES	71
Appendix 1	71
Appendix 2	72
Appendix 3	75
Appendix 4	76
KOKKUVÕTE	79
SUMMARY	82

INTRODUCTION

0.1 Foreword

Menis is the subject of the *Iliad*. It may be, and has been, translated as wrath, as rage, as anger. As classicist Leonard Muellner notes, “The subject of the *Iliad* is the anger of Achilles, not Achilles himself” (1996: 1). Therefore, we may ask: if contemporary novels adapt the of the story of the *Iliad*, do they also translate *menis*?

The term “adaptation,” writes Hendrik van Gorp, is used especially for works in which “the direct impact of the audience is of crucial importance for the success” of the target text (2004: 65). I am here examining the target texts for adaptation primarily in terms of content. In terms of adaptation of form, the target texts all generally adapt parts of verse epic into novel.

0.2 Research Questions, Aims & Goals

Questions

The question to be addressed is twofold. First: Do the adaptations of the *Iliad* translate *menis*? Second: If adaptations do translate *menis*, how? This second question is the true focus of the thesis, and may be expanded into a collection of questions:

- Which aspects of *menis* are preserved?
- In what manner(s) are those aspects preserved?
- Which aspects of wrath are omitted?
- Which aspects are transformed?

Aims & Goals

The aim of the thesis is to analyze the methods used to translate *menis* in the target-texts. This includes analyzing the causes, manifestations, and appeasements of *menis* in the individual target texts compared to the source text and the other target texts. The first goal of this analysis is to typologize and describe translations of the motif of *menis* as it appears in the target texts. The describe a paradigm of translated *menis* in 21st century novel adaptations of the *Iliad*.

0.3 Methodology

Major theoretical points of reference are Anton Popovič, Henrik van Gorp, Dirk Debastita, Sider Florin, and Yuri Lotman. The understanding of adaptation is based upon Anton Popovič's work on metatext and Hendrik van Gorp's elaboration on the place of adaptation in translation. Anton Popovič defines a prototext as "a text which serves as an object of inter-textual continuity" and a metatext as "a model of the prototext" in his 1976 article *Aspects of Metatext*. Popovič divides metatextual relations into two extremes of token:token operations and token:type operations to form a continuum along which metatextual relations fall (Popovič 1976: 227-228). Popovič also establishes and examines various "transformations" a prototext may undergo in a metatext: imitative continuity, selective continuity, reducing continuity, and complementary continuity (Popovič 1976: 231-232). Delabastita seems to build off of this in his 1993 work *There's a Double Tongue*, in which he schematizes and describes translation operations into substitution, repetition, omission, addition, and permutation and codes into source language to target language, source culture to target culture, and source text to target text (Delabastita 1993: 39). Delabastita's framework is further applied to Florin's concept of realia: "words [...] denoting objects and concepts characteristic of the way of life, the culture, the social and historical development" (Florin 1993: 123). Delabastita's work on translation, particularly his typology of transformation operations is used as a framework to typologize transformation operations in the translations of *menis* in *Iliad* adaptations.

In the same vein as Popovič and Delabastita, Van Gorp also creates a categorization of transformative operations in translation which does not vary significantly from Delabastita. However, especially pertinent to this work is his examination of substitution transformations, which includes detailed discussion of adaptation. Popovič applies the term "free translation" to the concept of "various forms of texts...which, depending on the prevailing opinions about texts and text processing, are not considered 'genuine' translations but still in one way or another represent a primary text with a comparable form and volume" (van Gorp 2004: 65) but van Gorp

favors “adaptation” over “free translation” as the term for the “overarching” concept here.

0.4 Historiography

There is a long history of adaptations of the *Iliad*. Arguably, the best known of these adaptations is *The Aeneid* of Virgil. This ancient example is by no means the extent of ancient *Iliad* adaptations, however. There is also a great body of scholarship on the study of classical works (including and prominently, the *Iliad*) adaptation from the Middle Ages to the present day. Most of these works approach adaptations from the standpoint of reception studies. Diane P. Thompson researches major works of reception of the Trojan Cycle, including the *Iliad*, and provides a chronological overview of the reception of “Troy” in her book *The Trojan War: Literature and Legends from the Bronze Age to the Present*. In one of the final chapters, Thompson provides a bibliography of literary works based on the Trojan story published in the twentieth century. Thompson states the purpose of this bibliography is “to indicate how deeply Troy stories have penetrated both literary and popular consciousness” in “the living popular continuity of Troy” as opposed to its academic “afterlife”(Thompson 2004: 207). In recent scholarship there has been an increased focus on modern adaptation as reception of the classics, especially in visual media such as graphic novel and film. There has also been some attention, from the perspective of classical civilization studies and reception studies, on adaptations as responses to the *Iliad* in modern prose fiction. The subject of the *Iliad*, *menis*, has been researched and debated extensively since antiquity. Most pertinent to this thesis will be thought on *menis* from Leonard Muellner, especially *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic* (1996).

0.5 Materials¹ & Scope

Source text

For the purposes of this thesis, I am relying primarily on several English-language

¹ See appendix 1 for more information on the target texts

translations of the *Iliad* of Homer. Specifically, the Robert Fagles translation (1990) and the Richmond Lattimore translation (1951). I justify the use of these English translations in combination as the source-text for two reasons. The first: although some of the target text authors may have knowledge of Homeric Greek and may even have read the *Iliad* in its original language, the source text of the *Iliad* for the authors is in English. Bassnett cites Derrida with the suggestion that “a translation may become the original”, which is certainly the case for the *Iliad*’s modern audience (1998: 25). She further clarifies that considering the approach of a reader with no knowledge of Ancient Greek to Homer’s work “what we are reading is an original through translation, i.e. that translation is our original” (Bassnett 1998: 25). Even though two of the target text authors acknowledge a background in classics that includes knowledge of Ancient Greek language, all of the target text authors encountered the story of the *Iliad* originally in translation which is the primary reason I believe using English translations as the source text (“the *Iliad*”) is acceptable. The reasoning for this particular selection of translations is a combination of popularity of translation (both are in wide circulation), availability of the translations when the authors were composing the target texts (both were published in the 20th century, and therefore would have been accessible to the authors when writing the target texts), and because in some cases they have been directly acknowledged in paratextual material by the author as their source text. Simmons (2003) and Clarke (2004) acknowledge both the Lattimore and Fagles translations as sources, and several other authors acknowledge one or the other in their concluding remarks.

Target texts

I have chosen a selection of ten target texts which all meet certain requirements. All were composed in English. All were published in the year 2000 or later. All are in prose fiction format. All are available to the public in the sense that they are published by a publishing house (as opposed to self published) and available in print (as opposed to only e-book).

Most importantly, all contain certain necessary elements of the *Iliad*. Specifically, they all contain, to varying degrees, the characters Achilles, Agamemnon, Patroclus and Hector, some mythologized-historicized version of the setting of “Troy”, and a disagreement between Achilles and Agamemnon and then Achilles and Hector. The reasoning for these being necessary elements to a translation (adaptation) of the *Iliad* may be seen in the plot summary, but in brief they are all necessary to the “defining narrative” of the *Iliad*, which is the *menis* of Achilles.

The target texts are the following titles:

- Bova, Ben 2010. *The Hittite*. New York: Tor.
- Clarke, Lindsay 2004. *The War at Troy*. London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Cook, Elizabeth 2003. *Achilles*. New York: Picador.
- Elyot, Amanda 2004. *The Memoirs of Helen of Troy*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- George, Margaret 2006. *Helen of Troy*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Geras, Adele 2002. *Troy*. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt.
- Malouf, David 2009. *Ransom*. New York: Vintage International.
- Miller, Madeline 2011. *The Song of Achilles*. New York: Ecco (Harper Collins).
- Simmons, David 2003. *Ilium*. New York: Harper Voyager.
- Starkston, Judith 2014. *Hand of Fire*. Tucson, AZ: Fireship Press.

Scope

In this work I will be attending to patterns in the translation of the motif of *menis* into 21st century prose fiction adaptations. The focus of analysis will be on the target texts rather than the source text, though it will be necessary to examine the source texts in order to analyze translations into the target texts. I will not be examining interlingual translations (that is, the series of linguistic changes—most notably, the entire change of language that the words went through from Homeric Greek to English) except in cases of realia. I will not be examining target texts that are not in prose fiction format, nor

target texts that were available to the public before the new millennium. I have attempted to choose a selection of the available novels which attempt to adapt the plot of the *Iliad*, and match the criteria listed in the above section.

Lattimore provides an outline of the *Iliad*'s essential and "irreducible" plot in his introduction to his translation. He divides the plot of the *Iliad* into three major 'acts': "1) Quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon. Withdrawal of Achilles. 2) Defeat of the Achaians by the Trojans and Hektor. 3) Intervention and death of Patroklos. Return of Achilles. Defeat of the Trojans. Death of Hektor." (Lattimore 1951: 30). I use Lattimore's outline as the basis for the plot which is adapted in the target texts, but to the third I add desecration of Hector and ransoming of Hector's body.

0.6 Source text introduction

The *Iliad* begins in the ninth year of the ten years long siege war at Troy. *Menin* begins the epic in the Greek—the accusative singular form of *menis*, which has been variously translated as wrath, rage, and anger. In the preface to the Fagles translation (1990), Bernard Knox explicitly acknowledges "the rage of Achilles—its cause, its course, and its disastrous consequences—is the theme of the poem, the mainspring of the plot" (Knox 1990: 3). The beginning line, the invocation to the muse, makes it obvious that this is not the story of the Trojan War, but the story of Achilles' *menis* and its consequences:

Wrath—sing, goddess, Peleus' son Achilles' [wrath]
destructive [wrath], which myriad woes caused,
many strong souls to Hades sent
[souls] of heroes, making them [their bodies] spoils for dogs
and birds, Zeus' will was being fulfilled
[begin to sing] from (where) the first dividing quarrel [of]
Atreus' son the king of men and godlike Achilles.²

Agamemnon's refusal to ransom his *geras* (loosely, "prize"), Chryseis, back to her father invokes the *menis* of Apollo. The god shoots arrows of infectious death into

² My translation, used here to show emphasis of meaning in source text rather than conform to English language conventions.

the Greek camps, until the leaders gather in desperation to discover the cause of their misfortune and the way it might be reversed. The seer Calchas informs the assembly that in order to resolve their problem, the Achaean (Greek) host, specifically Agamemnon, must return Chryseis to her father. Agamemnon is dishonored by having to return his *geras* (prize), and when Achilles argues that even so he must return the girl to save the Greek army, Agamemnon seizes Achilles' *geras*, Briseis. Thus, Achilles' *menis* begins:

The *Iliad* shows us the origin, course and consequences of his rage, his imprisonment in a godlike, lonely heroic fury from which all the rest of the world is excluded, and also his return to human stature. The road to this final release is long and grim, strewn with the corpses of many a Greek and Trojan, and it leads finally to his own death. (Knox 1990: 47)

In *Troy and Homer* (2004), Latacz argues that Homer's *Iliad* is a "secondary source" of a mythography of a Trojan War and that "The larger story of the Trojan War—with its cause, its course, and its consequences—thus becomes a framing structure, which needs only to be mentioned as background, and in the chosen segment a contemporary problem is explored" (Latacz 2004: 201). Therefore, in addition to the irreducible plot as outlined by Lattimore, it is essential to adaptation of the *Iliad* that it take place in "Troy." The plot of the *Iliad* is inseparable of the value system within it; the very plot of the *Iliad* is the violation of its value system. As Linda Hutcheon points out, "value systems are context dependent" (2006: 142). Therefore, the plot of the *Iliad* cannot be removed from its context within "Troy," because "An adaptation, like the work it adapts, is always framed in a context—a time and a place, a society and a culture; it does not exist in a vacuum" (Hutcheon 2006: 142). The *Iliad* is not the story of the Trojan War; it is the story of Achilles' wrath, which was a new feature in an already existing Trojan War tradition. "The new content" which was the story of the *Iliad* and the ideas it explored, "the communication of which was Homer's real purpose, consisted of the Achilles story, with its statement of questions current at the time when the story originated" (Latacz 2004: 204). The contextualization of what is called "the Achilles story" within the "Trojan War story" demonstrates that "we cannot learn from

the *Iliad* the whole tale of the Troy or the whole story of the Trojan War in the form known to the original audience” (Latacz 2004: 205).

1. ADAPTATION

1.1 Metatext

Adaptation is “repetition with difference” (Hutcheon 2006: 142). For an adaptation, this means that change from the source text to the target text (the adaptation) is inevitable, and “there will also be multiple possible causes of change in the process of adapting made by the demands of form, the individual adapter, the particular audience, and now the contexts of reception and creation” (Hutcheon 2006: 142). With that in mind, the focus of this thesis is not on the causes of change but the processes of change themselves. To examine these processes, it is beneficial to begin with Anton Popovič’s concepts of prototext and metatext, and the transformations elements of prototext may undergo in metatext.

Prototext and metatext are terms that are intricately bound: a prototext may in theory be any text; a metatext is a text which responds to this initial “prototext”. In terms of adaptation, the text which is adapted serves as the prototext, and the adaptation itself is the metatext. Popovič outlines the possible transformations of the prototext into the metatext. Popovič divides transformations in terms of continuity between proto and metatext (or, source and target text): imitative continuity, selective continuity, reducing continuity, complementary continuity (Popovič 1976: 231-232). In imitative continuity, the target text imitates the “pattern” of the source text—“quotation, transcription, translation, plagiarism” are metatexts that fall under the transformations of imitative continuity (Popovič 1976: 232). Selective continuity transformations utilize some aspects, but not others, of the source text (Popovič 1976: 232). Popovič puts parodies, pastiches, and “imitation” in this category, because they are metatexts which use “the rules of the construction of the prototext, in a broader, modelling sense” (1976: 232). Reducing continuity is transformations in which target texts “condense” their source texts; these are transformations such as commentaries and summaries, or paratextual information such as titles and annotations (Popovič 1976: 232). Finally, complementary

continuity transformations “develop or complete invariant qualities” of the source text, such as “appendices, epilogue, notes” (Popovič 1976: 232).

“Adaptation can occur on the level both of form and of content” writes van Gorp (2004: 65). He even gives the example for formal adaptation that it “can be found in the ‘translation’ of lyrical or epic verse into prose for a different audience or readership” (van Gorp 2004: 65). In the case of the adaptation of the target texts examined in this thesis, the form is being adapted from epic verse or prose into novel. Although the novel may be considered the ‘direct descendant’ of poetic epic, this is a not insignificant adaptation of form. Mikhail Bakhtin characterizes the epic genre with three features: a national epic past, a national tradition, and epic distance (1982: 13). Most relevant to the target texts is the notion of epic distance:

The formally constitutive feature of the epic as a genre is [...] the transferral of a represented world into the past, and the degree to which this world participates in the past. The epic was never a poem about the present, about its own time [...]. The epic, as the specific genre known to us today, has been from its beginning a poem about the past, and the authorial position immanent in the epic and constitutive for it (that is, the position of the one who utters the epic word) is the environment of a man speaking about a past that is to him inaccessible, the reverent point of view of a descendent. In its style, tone and manner of expression, epic discourse is infinitely far removed from discourse of a contemporary about a contemporary addressed to contemporaries (Bakhtin 1982: 13)

Epic distance is maintained in the target texts analyzed. They are all works of historical fiction, historical fantasy, and even science fiction; the target texts are authors speaking to an audience about a past, a world, that is inaccessible. What is less successfully preserved in adaptation of form are the features of “national epic past” and “national tradition.” Time and space separate the source text audience from the audience of the target texts. In order to cross this gap of time and space, the target texts adapt content as a way of adapting form. In this analysis of the motif of *menis* in *Iliad* adaptations, adaptation of form to adaptations of content.

On adaptations of content, van Gorp notes that “Adaptations of content are

legion and concern the well-known dilemma: Either translate the foreign text as a foreign text [...] or adapt it for the target audience” (van Gorp 2004: 66). Concern for translating the signs of *menis*, in its causes, manifestations, and appeasement stems from this dilemma voiced by van Gorp. Although adaptation is a form of translation, “Adaptation is a form of text processing which as it were imposes itself when the cultural context of the source text is unknown or exotic to the target audience and therefore has perforce to be adapted if the ‘translation’ is to be understood” (van Gorp 2004: 66).

Adaptations are intertexts: “When we call a work an adaptation, we openly announce its overt relationship to another work or works” (Hutcheon 2006: 6). An adaptation is an artistic text in its own right, but it is only its relation as a work that responds to an earlier text that the work may be termed an adaptation (Hutcheon 2006: 6). Therefore, adaptation has a double nature as both transposition of a work(s) and a process of creation (Hutcheon 2006: 7-8). The *Iliad* itself is already intertextual--the story of the *Iliad* emerged from the preexisting Trojan War tradition. The use of the *Iliad* as a context is part of a long tradition: “What remains common to all writing of this kind is that in each case is embedded in a canonical narrative structure, the basis of which it does not change or cannot change, so that the structure is recognizable and usable” (Latacz 2004: 202). “Within pre-set parameters, however, much may be invented and much put to new uses” (Latacz 2004: 202).

1.2 Cultural recoding

There is inevitable asymmetry between a source text and target text when the source text culture and the target text culture are different. Delabastita writes that there are two basic strategies for approaching the asymmetry between target cultural code and source cultural code, and these are analogous strategy and homologous strategy (Delabastita 1993: 17-19).

The analogous strategy approaches the problem by replacing source text (source code) items with target code items which emphasize the cultural meaning of the item

over its linguistic meaning (Delabastita 1993: 17). This is the analogous strategy because the item is replaced by a cultural analogue: its “relative value” within the target cultural code is an “approximation” of its value of the item it replaces within the source cultural code (Delabastita 1993: 17). Delabastita argues that this analogous replacement must always be a “very rough approximation”, though, because “cultural meanings cannot really be divorced from the cultural code that generated them”(Delabastita 1993: 18). Cultural analogues may also attempt to maintain cultural equivalence “at the cost of the degree of linguistic equivalence” (Delabastita 1993: 17-18). Delabastita also acknowledges that cultural analogues tend to become outdated fairly quickly: “The more references to contemporary target culture, the sooner the [target text] will be obsolete” (Delabastita 1993: 18).

The other strategy for dealing with asymmetry is the “production of cultural homologues” (Delabastita 1993: 19). The salient difference between cultural analogues and cultural homologues is that the source text linguistic item, and the source text culture, is “viewed as a formal unit (plane of signifiers) rather than a semantic-functional unit (plane of signifieds)” due to the very nature of cultural signifiers (Delabastita 1993: 19). Delabastita defines cultural signifiers as “the entire linguistic sign to which the cultural meaning is attached” (Delabastita 1993: 19):

Therefore, when a homological method is used for the transfer of cultural signs, the rendering of the additional cultural semantics of the relevant S.T. items is really made subordinate to a maximally equivalent rendering of these items from a linguistic point of view. From the point of view of the cultural codes in question, we are dealing here with a process of formal *copy* in which the S.T. semantics are virtually being ignored. This may occasionally lead to opacity or even serious misapprehensions (*cultural false cognates*), especially if large distances are to be spanned. (Delabastita 1993: 19)

Essentially, meaning that was present in the source text may actually be omitted or altered in the target text even when its cultural sign is transferred from the source text to the target text. Delabastita believes that the overall effect of cultural homologues that results from this is a kind of exoticism of cultural signifier that was neither intended nor

perceived by the creator(s) of the source text nor by the source culture (Delabastita 1993: 19).

In most cases, it seems the analogous strategy is more likely extends the longevity of code while the homologous strategy more likely shortens the longevity of code. A code's longevity depends on "the permanence of its basic structural principles and by its inner dynamism—its capacity for change while still preserving the memory of preceding states and consequently, of awareness of its own coherence" (Lotman, Uspensky 1978: 215). Using a broad definition of culture as the long-term memory of a community, Lotman and Uspensky say culture is "filled" through quantitative increase in the amount of knowledge, redistribution in structure "resulting in a change in the very notion of 'a fact to be remembered,' including hierarchical categorization of those facts to be remembered, and finally, forgetting (Lotman and Uspensky 1978: 215-216). Change of code over time may cause a culture not to "be perceived as continuous, and so the various stages of the processes can be taken for different cultures contrasting with one another" (Lotman and Uspensky 1978: 224). In Lotman and Uspensky's definition of culture, analogous strategy and homologous strategy both help and hinder the longevity of code.

1.3 Typology of transformation operations

Delabastita describes five categories of transformation processes in translation, which occur on the levels of linguistic code, cultural code, and textual code (Delabastita 1993: 39). These categories are substitution, repetition, deletion, addition, and permutation. He writes that these five categories and three levels ought to theoretically be "necessary and sufficient" to describe and analyze the relations between source and target text, however, the reality is more difficult to categorize (Delabastita 1993: 37). This is due in no small part to the "problematic nature of the theoretical boundaries between the three codes" (Delabastita 1993: 37).

Substitution is an analogous strategy in which a source text (source code) object

is replaced by an “equivalent” target code object (Delabastita 1993: 34). It is, therefore, an inherently analogous operation. Analogy does not have fixed forms, though, and “Certain substitutions will in specific conditions be felt to constitute a higher degree of equivalence and be judged better or closer analogues than others” (Delabastita 1993: 34).

Repetition is a homologous operation in which a source text object is transferred directly or “repeated” in the target text (Delabastita 1993: 34). A particularly important function of the repetition operation is that they have the ability to bring about changes in the target code, or reinforce aspects of the code: “Through homologues translation may become a channel for the introduction of new items” in the target code, and also a method for “modification of existing ones” (Delabastita 1993: 34-35). A successful repetition operation is an occurrence of repetition from source to target which is not perceived to be repetition at all (Delabastita 1993: 35). On the level of target language, Delabastita provides the example of the “gradual adoption of loanwords into the lexicon” of the target language (Delabastita 1993: 35).

Deletion is omission or “lessening” in the target text of an object present in the source text. Deletions are frequent in translations, and often unavoidable when a translator must negotiate which of the source texts items and structural patterns to translate “with a maximal degree of equivalence” and which may be “sacrificed” in favor of the more important items (Delabastita 1993: 36). Not all items that are “deleted” in a target text are entirely erased, though. A target text may include a deleted element as a “weakly equivalent analogue”, or in elsewhere in the target text, or through some form of compensatory method (Delabastita 1993: 36). Compensatory methods may range from in-text explanation or paraphrasing, or paratextual information such as glossaries.

In the addition operation, the target text “turns out to contain linguistic, cultural, or textual component signs that have no apparent antecedent” within the source text (Delabastita 1993: 36). Although there may be any number of reasons for an addition, Delabastita remarks that source texts tend to be “expanded” in the target text in an

attempt to clarify unfamiliar ideas or establish coherence (Delabastita 1993: 36). This enables reader of the target text to “disentangle complicated passages, provide missing links, lay bare unspoken assumptions, and generally give the text a fuller wording” (Delabastita 1993: 36). The addition operation and the deletion operation compensate for each other in translations (van Gorp 2004: 64). Van Gorp writes that because addition and deletion are combined with repetition, “Translation is thus always a meta-text par excellence, that is to say a text which ‘responds’ to an existing text in another language” (van Gorp 2004: 64).

Delabastita’s final category of transformation is permutation.³ Permutation is a category which “does not pertain to the actual transfer of individual signs” writes Delabastita, but instead permutation deals with “relationships between the sign’s respective positions in the source texts and target texts” because the source text item is rendered in the target text [...] but its position within the target text does not reflect the relative position of its source text counterpart” (Delabastita 1993: 36). Especially pertinent to adaptation of motif, and adaptation in general, is one particular feature of permutation. This feature is permutation’s ability to include and differentiate between the textual level and the metatextual level. Delabastita writes that a translator either “relegates his/her rendering” of an item of the source text to a textual level or a metatextual level of discourse (1993: 37). Here, it is beneficial to examine Popovič’s definition and model of metatext. In relation to a source text (which Popovič calls a “prototext”), a metatext is a “model” of the source text (Popovič 1976: 226).

³ A major form of permutation is paratextual information such as glossaries. Of the target texts, five of ten of include a glossary of characters, two of the five also include a glossary of geographical locations, one of the five includes a map, and one of the five which did not include a glossary of characters or places did include a map.

<i>Code</i>	S.ling.code → T.ling.code	S.cult.code → T.cult.code	S.text.code → T.text.code
Operation			
Substitution	higher or lower degree of (approximate) linguistic equivalence	naturalization modernization topicalization nationalization	systemic, acceptable text (potentially conservative) adaptation
Repetition	<i>total</i> : non-translation, copy <i>partial</i> : calque, literal translation, word-for-word translation	exoticization historization (through the mere intervention of time-place distance)	non-systemic, non-acceptable text (potentially innovative)
Deletion	reductive translation abridged version undertranslation expressive reduction	universalization dehistorization (through the removal of foreign cultural signs)	T.T. is a less typical specimen of a (target) text-type neutralization of stylistic or generic peculiarities
Addition	paraphrastic translation more explicit text overtranslation expressive amplification	exoticization historization (through the positive addition of foreign cultural signs)	T.T. is a more typical specimen of a (target) text-type introduction of stylistic or generic markers
Permutation	(metatextual) compensation	(metatextual) compensation	(metatextual) compensation

Table 1. Transformations operations (Delabastita 1993: 39)

1.4 Realia

Important to the notion of cultural translation is realia. Within Delabastita's category of "deletion" (and van Gorp's "detractio") there exist certain "untranslatable" cultural objects and concepts. To address these untranslatable cultural features, Florin and Vlahov coin the term "realia". Realia refers to "objects and concepts characteristic of the way of life, the culture, the social and historical development" of a source culture

and language which may not be directly or conventionally translated into a target language (Florin 1993: 123). One view of realia is that it constitutes “background knowledge” or “common knowledge”: what the target audience of a text may be reasonably expected to understand which a person outside the target audience may not understand (Florin 1993: 123).

A major aspect of realia is that they are inherently untranslatable in the sense of interlingual translation (Florin 1993: 125). This untranslatability is due to the absence of “equivalents” or “analogs” in the target language (or culture) and “the need to communicate the objective meaning of realia to the target reader along with their local or historical color, or connotation” (Florin 1993: 125). Therefore, there are two options available to translate realia for the target reader—transcription or substitution (Florin 1993: 125). Transcription is described as “mechanical transfer” from the source language to target language (Florin 1993: 125). Florin mentions only transcription in his typology, but van Gorp includes transliteration and metaphrase as forms of transcription. Transliteration is a “letter-for-letter (*littera*) reproduction of signs from one writing system to another” as well as metaphrase (van Gorp 2004: 64). Metaphrase is similar to transliteration in that it is word-for-word (or even sentence-for-sentence) transcription from a source text into a target text (van Gorp 2004: 64).

Substitution, according to Florin, is used only when transcription is unacceptable: “when transcription is considered unsuitable, undesirable, or even impossible, realia are introduced by means of several kinds of substitutions” (1993: 125). Florin describes several types of substitutions used to translate realia, including neologisms, approximate translation, functional equivalents/analogs, descriptions and explanations. Neologisms are any sort of “new word” but Florin specifically discusses calque (also known as loan words or translation loan words).

Approximate translation utilizes general terms instead of specific to communicate realia (Florin 1993: 126). The result of using approximate translation is that “local color” is always lost (Florin 1993: 126). Approximate translation falls

primarily into Delabastita's category of analogous strategies, because approximate translation replaces source text items with target code items and give credence to the cultural significance of an item over its linguistic meaning, which is what analogous strategies attempt (Delabastita 1993: 17). But because the approximate translation places this emphasis on cultural significance rather than linguistics it is possible that some instances approximate translation may fall into the category of homologous strategy, because a "general" term may not actually be "general" even though it is perceived as such by the target audience.

Functional equivalents are cultural analogues used to translate realia (Florin 1993: 126). Functional equivalents may be used to try to "achieve a reaction on the part of the reader of the translation that they consider similar to the reaction of the reader to the original" (Florin 1993: 126). Another purpose for the use of functional equivalent is to "substitute" a familiar object for an unknown one or "inconvenient" for the purpose of expediency and clarity (1993: 126).

Florin writes that when translating realia, description and explanation are the option of last resort, used "when it is impossible to render realia in any other way" (Florin 1993: 126). However, description and explanation "do not render the actual realia, but rather their meaning, or content, as dictionaries do" (1993: 126).

2. THE MOTIF OF *MENIS*

2.1 Definition and explanation of *menis*

Μηνίς, μῆνιν — the closest English equivalent to this word is “wrath” but even this falls short of this word’s scale. Wrath is the conventional English translation (Muellner 1996: 138) for a word which may also be translated in variants such as anger or rage divine in nature.

Leonard Muellner explains that merely naming *menis* as anger or rage does not allow for the true function of the word to be understood. These translations relegate *menis* to merely the status of an emotion, whereas *menis* is truly a “sanction meant to guarantee and maintain the integrity of the world order” for “every time it is invoked, the hierarchy of the cosmos is at stake” (Muellner 1996: 26). According to Muellner, the interpretation of *menis* as only an emotion is a mistake that arises from cultural differences in the understanding of emotional and social terms (1996: 138). Modern Western culture perceives emotion as primarily an individual, internal phenomenon which effect society secondarily while in Archaic Greece, for the idea of *menis* “social dimension is neither secondary to its emotional one nor divisible into inner and outer aspects” (1996: 138). In essence, *menis* is both a feeling and a consequence: in our closest word, a wrath. Thus, the idea of *menis* is inextricable from “principle of solidarity and continuity” (Muellner 1996: 27).

Leonard Muellner provides an outline of offenses (1996: 8) which cause, or threaten to cause, *menis* in the Homeric corpus and which is summarized here:

- disobedience of Ares to Zeus’ commands in *Iliad* 5
- disobedience of mortal warriors to Apollo’s prohibitions
- defiance by Achilles to Agamemnon’s authority
- rape of Persephone by Hades
- mortals having sex with goddesses
- leaving the dead unburied
- desecrating a sacrifice

- violating exchange rules:
 - of hospitality & treatment of beggars
 - of ransom
 - of prize distribution

The conclusion Muellner reaches is that *menis* is incurred by “breaking of religious and social tabus” (1996: 8). Because *menis* applies to taboos both human and divine, it is “a form of justice” that is “simultaneously cosmic and personal” (Allan 2006: 3):

[...] cosmic in that it embraces divine as well as human society and is connected to the maintenance of order on both levels; personal (and therefore volatile) in that it is intended to control individual conduct and self-interest (whether of gods or humans) and depends for its ultimate sanction on the personal authority of Zeus himself. (Allan 2006: 3)

From Muellner’s list, in the *Iliad*, the audience is witness to situations which incur (or threaten to incur) *menis*: “disobedience of Ares to Zeus,” “disobedience of mortal warriors to Apollo’s prohibitions,” “defiance of Achilles to Agamemnon’s authority,” “leaving the dead unburied,” and “violating exchange rules” of ransom and prize distribution.

Graziosi and Haubold draw a parallel between the *menis* of Achilles in the *Iliad* and the *menis* of Demeter. Muellner noted “the rape of Persephone” in his typology as its own category. Demeter “is so angry and pained by the loss of her daughter that she inflicts death by starvation until she is appeased with the promise of time among gods and mortals” (Graziosi, Haubold 2004: 110). There is a significant difference between Demeter and Achilles which makes her *menis* acceptable, and his unacceptable, though. Demeter is a goddess, and as a goddess once her *menis* is appeased she is “able to bestow prosperity on humankind” once her *timē* is restored, whereas Achilles is only able to return to his great but still merely human power and behavior (Graziosi, Haubold 2005: 130). Achilles’ role in the cosmos is to behave as a responsible man and a leader during his mortal life (Graziosi, Haubold 2005: 130).

2.2 *Menis* as realia

Menis is conventionally translated in English as “wrath,” which Muellner defines as “an epic term for a violent emotional response by a powerful personage, divine or human” (1996: 138).

The essential problem is the distinction we draw between emotional and social terms. For us, emotions are primarily individualized and internal, and their social dimensions are semantically secondary. With *menis*, however, its social dimension is neither secondary to its emotional one nor divisible into inner and outer aspects” (Muellner 1996: 138).

Transliteration is “letter-for-letter (littera) reproduction from one writing system to another” (van Gorp 2004: 64). Only in *Ilium* by Simmons (2003) is *menis* explicitly transliterated as the narrator Hockenberry discusses his work as a Classics scholar and the fact that he wrote a 935 page book on the word *menin* (Simmons 2003: 54).⁴ But Simmons repeatedly emphasizes “rage” as the translation of *menis*, going so far as to echo the opening of the *Iliad* in the opening of *Ilium*. The novel opens with Hockenberry invoking the muses to sing of rage—his rage. The opening lines follow Fagles’ translation (1990) nearly word for word before veering off to set up Hockenberry’s *menis*:

Rage.

Sing, O Muse, of the rage of Achilles, of Peleus’ son, murderous, man-killer, fated to die, sing of the rage that cost the Achaeans so many good men and sent so many vital, hearty souls down to the dreary House of Death. [...]

Oh, and sing of me, O Muse, poor born-again-against-his will Hockenberry--poor dead Thomas Hockenberry, Ph.D., Hockenbush to his friends, to friends long since turned to dust on a world long since left behind. Sing of *my* rage, yes, of my *rage*, O Muse, small and insignificant though that rage may be when measured against the anger of the immortal gods, or when compared to the wrath of the god-killer, Achilles. (Simmons 2003: 1-2)

⁴ Aphrodite to Hockenberry: “Your book ran to 935 pages and it was all about one word—Menin.”(Simmons 2003: 54)

However, other concepts are transliterated in the target texts. Miller in particular makes frequent use of transliterations. Most prevalent transliterations, in Miller and in the rare instances in other texts, are related to titles and descriptions of characters and formulaic epithets used in the source text. For instance, *aristos achaion* (“best of the Achaeans”) appears frequently in Miller’s *The Song of Achilles* (2011).

In the majority of cases the target text authors use an analogous strategy or homologous strategy to relate the concept of *menis*. *Menis* is translated as rage, wrath, anger, godlike anger, and fury, but these translations are not able to, in a single word, indicate to the target audience the meaning of the realia that is *menis*. The target text authors encountered the problem of how to translate an untranslatable. The approaches used by the authors to address this problem are typologized into transformations of substitution, repetition, addition, deletion, and permutation.

2.2.1 Other realia in source text

Understanding, and translating, *menis* relies upon a frame of reference for the archaic Greek social system as a whole. It is not simply enough to translate *menis* without also translating its other intricately related realia. *Menis* is the result of “outrageous behavior” and “The ordering principles for human beings in the *Iliad* are right behavior, piety, human justice, and the plan of Zeus. So long as people behave, the gods stay pretty much out of their lives. But when outrageous behavior begins and gods are foolishly invoked, the gods become involved in human affairs” (Thompson 2004: 56).

Xenia

Xenia is commonly understood as “guest friendship” or “hospitality.” A more thorough definition of *xenia* is that it is “obligations arising from the relationship of a guest and a host and the claim of strangers to protection” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 283). It is a system of ritual hospitality: “[...] ritualised friendship is here defined as a bond of solidarity manifesting itself in an exchange of goods and services between individuals

originating from separate social units” (Herman 1987: 10). “The semantic range of these words is sometimes extremely wide; ‘xenos’, for instance, in addition to ‘guest-friend’, can mean ‘foreigner’, ‘stranger’, ‘guest’, ‘host’ and ‘mercenary soldier’” (Herman 1987: 10). The most important similarity between kinship and *xenia* was “the assumption of perpetuity” because “once the rites establishing the relationships were completed, the bond was believed to persist in latent form even if the partners did not interact with one another” (Herman 1987: 16). The assumption of perpetuity served two important functions: bonds of *xenia* “could be renewed or reactivated after the lapse of many years” a variety of symbolic objects serving as a reminder. Secondly, the bond did not expire with the death of the partners themselves but outlived them and passed on, apparently in the male line, to their descendants” (Herman 1987: 16-17). An example of the *xenia* being explained to someone outside of the system appears in one of the target texts:

Suddenly both men dropped their weapons and shields, rushed to each other, and embraced like a pair of long-lost brothers. I was stunned.

“They must have relatives in common,” Poletes explained. “Or one of them might have been a guest in the other’s household sometime in the past.”

“But the battle...”

Poletes shook his gray head. “What has that to do with it? There are plenty of others to kill.”

The two warriors exchanged swords, then each got back onto his chariot and they drove in opposite directions.

“No wonder this war has lasted for years,” I muttered. (Bova 2010: 49)

Moirā

Moirā is one’s “due measure” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 273). It is the “part, portion, division” that is allotted to a person by society, and also what is allotted to a person by the gods. It’s both similar modern Western concept “a paycheck from your boss” and the concept of “fate” or “destiny” (but different in that it focuses more on *timē* and *kleos* in the fate sense). “*Moirā* in Homeric and other early Greek expresses the “share” in life which one has: not merely its length, but one’s possessions, birth, and everything else which contributes to determining one’s status in a stratified society” (Adkins 1982: 300).

It is “one’s fate or destiny, what is allotted by fate” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 273). Through this definition, we see the other aspect of *moira*: death. Every person born must die; it is the *moira* of mortals to die.

Geras

Geras is a “special category of prize, one that goes beyond the ordinary *moira* (rightful portion) of the warrior” (Staten 1993: 342). A *geras* is a special “mark of distinction” (Staten 1993: 342). A *geras* is a physical manifestation of a warrior’s *timē* (honor). Briseis is often referred to as Achilles’ “prize” or “honor” in the source text—this is because she was presented to Achilles as a *geras* from the Greek army some time before the beginning of the *Iliad*. Most target texts do not distinguish her a “special” category of prize, though. They do translate that she was awarded to him as a prize, or even as a “war prize”. For example: “[...] a prize of war a captured slave-girl, Briseis” (Malouf 2009: 17). T

Some target texts employ the “addition” strategy in order to emphasize that Briseis’ status as prize does not stem from the same understanding of “prize” in modern American society. In Miller’s novel, the narrative states: “Briseis was a war prize, a living embodiment of Achilles’ honor” (Miller 2011: 282). It is this addition of “a living embodiment of Achilles’ honor” (Miller 2011: 282) that attempts to translate the source culture concept of *geras* where the simple “prize” or “war prize” falls short.

Timē

According to Cunliffe, *timē* is “The value or estimation in which a person is held, position in a scale of honour, estimation, regard” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 383). *Timē* is conventionally translated into English as “honor” but despite the interlingual translation, “This is not to say that ‘honour’ and *timē* are strictly equivalent” (Finkelberg 1998: 16). *Timē* has an inherent inseparability from outward, physical manifestations of “honor” in the *Iliad*. Not (only) an abstract concept the way it is in contemporary Western society, but something that could actually be measured materially. These

physical manifestations might be choice cuts of meat, or desirable possessions, for example (Finkelberg 1998: 16). Finkelberg posits that a better interlingual translation might not be an “unqualified” version of the word honor, but words such as “status” or “prestige” (1998: 16). “Status” and/or “prestige” (presumably) offers a nuance lacking in the broad term “honor.”

However, *timē* was not restricted to physical manifestations of status. There is a close relationship between the concepts of *timē* and *kleos*: *timē*, as earthly, immediate prestige is the way through which heroes can achieve everlasting fame, *kleos*. This means that “In their quest for honour, *timē*, the heroes resemble the gods” (Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 101). At the same time, a question of the true worth of prestige arises: “[...] in *Iliad* 9 [Achilles] suggests that no amount of *timē* can compensate for his death” (Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 110).

Kleos

Kleos is, in a broad sense, “good report or repute, fame, glory, or honour” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 229). The definition of “good report” has the connotation of a person having *kleos* as having a “reputation for skill” in some way (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 229). But *kleos* is not exclusively used for people. In its plural form, *kleos* refers to an act itself; “klea” are “famous deeds, high achievement,” and “notable conduct” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 229). Cunliffe also provides other, similar, definitions for *kleos*: “In reference to things, fame, celebrity” and “Something that brings fame or honour or confers distinction” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 229). The overarching meaning apparent in definitions of *kleos* is fame, to be widely known for ‘good’ reasons (as opposed to notoriety). This is unsurprising, as the word *kleos* is closely related to the verb “to hear/to be famed” (Cunliffe 2012[1924]: 229).

In the definition of the plural (“famous deeds”), it becomes apparent that *kleos* as “fame” is action or practice rather than a state of being, contrary to the way a modern Western might conceptualize fame. A person is not *kleos*, but instead achieves or strives for *kleos*. When we understand *kleos* as ongoing action rather than a passive state,

aspects of the famous deeds become more understandable. The quickest way for a warrior to achieve *kleos* is in *aristeia* (single combat with worthy enemy warriors). Finkelberg writes that “it is in confrontation with the enemy rather than competition against his equals and peers that the Homeric warrior earns his glory (*kleos*)” (Finkelberg 1998: 19).

Kleos is founded upon *timē*. “Material goods (i.e. Briseis)” function as physical manifestations of a warrior’s *timē* (Holmes 2007: 52). When Agamemnon seizes Briseis he “undermines” *timē* by refusing to adhere to this system “by which warriors gain honor” in battle (Holmes 2007: 52). This violation threatens Achilles’ honor on two levels: his *timē* as present, worldly honor and his *kleos*, his eternal glory (Holmes 2007: 52). It is the threat to his *kleos* that is more important to Achilles because it is undying fame that serves as compensation for Achilles’ death.

Ransoming and equivalence

The *Iliad* is a chronicle of the breakdown of conventional equivalences that underpin social order. “The *Iliad* [...] marks the breakdown of the condition of stalemate/equilibrium, and this breakdown takes the form of a breakdown in the circulation of equivalences” (Staten 1993: 345). The problem of the *Iliad* is “an accelerating crisis of equivalence” in a society in which “The system of conventional equivalences is central to the system of social order” (Staten 1993: 345). “The crucial point is that ransom or reparation is only worth the injury it comes to make up for if the injured party agrees it is” (Staten 1993: 345).

3. TRANSLATION OF CAUSES

3.1 Transformations of dishonor

Both the *menis* of Apollo and Achilles in incurred in the first book of the *Iliad* through violations of *timē*. *Timē* is traditionally understood, and thus translated, as “honor,” but differing concepts of “honor” in the source culture and the target culture may lead to loss of meaning or substitution of meaning even as the motif is repeated.

3.1.1 Deletion and repetition of dishonor of authority of the gods

At the very beginning of the *Iliad*, audience learns that the *menis* of Achilles is divinely caused: “What god drove them to fight with such a fury? / Apollo the son of Zeus and Leto” (Fagles 1990: 1.8-9). Apollo is himself invoking *menis* in the beginning of the *Iliad*. Chryses, priest of Apollo, attempts to ransom his daughter from Agamemnon. He approaches Agamemnon in the proper form as a supplicant, and offers “splendid ransom” for the return of his daughter:

For that one [Chryses] went up to the swift ships, desiring to
ransom his daughter, and also bringing bounteous ransom,
Chryses holding in his hands the wreaths of the farshooter Apollo
[...]

[Chryses speaking:] “Now: both free my dear daughter and accept these ransoms
[*which is action] reverencing Zeus’ son, the farshooter Apollo.”
Then all other Achaeans boisterously assented to
revere the priest and receive the splendid ransom.
But not to the son of Atreus, Agamemnon, was it pleasing in his spirit
But evilly he sent away [Chryses][...]
(*Iliad* 11-25)⁵

Agamemnon’s refusal of the ransom and dismissal of Chryses invokes *menis* for closely linked reasons that at first glance may not seem separate. First, Agamemnon’s refusal of “bounteous” ransom is a violation of the exchange rules of Homeric society. Second, and more importantly to Apollo: Agamemnon is dishonoring him in two ways.

⁵ My translation, used to show emphasis of meaning in source text rather than conform to English language conventions.

Agamemnon is both refusing to reverence him by accepting the ransom, as it was explicitly stated that accepting the ransom would be an act reverencing Apollo, and also dishonoring Apollo by insulting and casting out his priest, Chryses. Reverence is what is owed to a god; it is simultaneously Apollo's *moira* and his *timē*. In terms of violating Apollo's *moira*, Agamemnon is refusing to follow the obligations of his exchange society by accepting the ransom which is already an affront to the order the gods maintain in the universe, and he is also refusing it despite Chryses invoking Apollo as the 'arbiter' of the exchange. Furthermore, Chryses is a priest of Apollo, and as such is a physical embodiment of Apollo's *timē* the same way Agamemnon views Chryseis as a physical embodiment of his *timē*, yet Agamemnon insults the priest and sends him away.

3.1.2 Repetition and substitution of dishonor of authority of men

It has long been noted that one of the major struggles in the *Iliad* is the question of superiority among men in an emerging hierarchy. Is Agamemnon, leader of men, or Achilles, most godlike of men superior? Whose *menis* is more to be feared? Most of the target texts repeat this ongoing power struggle, but extensive substitution and addition transformations are necessary for the target audience's understanding. For example, in *Ilium* (Simmons 2003) during the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, Simmons has Agamemnon explicitly state that the ultimate struggle is over authority: "Know this, Achilles [...] whether you leave or stay, I will give up my Chryseis because the god, Apollo, insists—but I will have your Briseis in her stead, and every man here will know how much greater man is Agamemnon than the surly boy Achilles!" (Simmons 2003: 18).

In the struggle over Briseis, multiple target texts include in-text explication that Briseis is not the true object of their struggle and is instead the symbolic 'prize' in a battle of wills:

The strain between Achilles and Agamemnon was not over a sexual partner; it was a matter of honor and stubborn pride. (Bova 2010: 60)

I surmised that this quarrel between the two most influential Achaeans had little to do with either of the two slave girls, much as this entire bloody conflict had little to do with my flight from Sparta. The real prize was power. [...] Something else was at work here, too. Having been raised in the Achaean culture, I understood what the Trojan herald could not: the other reason that the unfortunate Briseis could not have been one of the genuine causes of the present quarrel. For Achilles to forfeit Briseis to Agamemnon at the High King's whim or command was tantamount to an acknowledgment of Agamemnon's supremacy, something the prideful Achilles bristled at, believing himself the better man in every way. It was arrogance, not love, that fueled the fire between the two warriors. (Elyot 2005: 209-210)

The transformation operation of substitution comes into play through the various ways target text authors employ to translate the enormity of the offense of the violation of exchange rules: obligation 'rules' concerning prize distribution, ransom, supplication, and hospitality. In *The Memoirs of Helen of Troy* (Elyot 2005), Helen is enraged by Agamemnon's infidelity to her sister, Clytemnestra. This is a substitution operation in the sense that Helen is offended by the breach of her sister's 'honor' by Agamemnon, viewing their marriage as a reciprocal social obligation which Agamemnon is violating the same way Achilles views Agamemnon as violating their reciprocal obligations. Helen thinks: "I would have stolen a knife, sneaked into his tent, and stabbed the adulterous High King in the heart". Similarly, Helen in *Helen of Troy* (George 2006) thinks "It seemed that Agamemnon had already built himself a wooden hut and packed it full with women. [...] it made my heart burn to think of him [Agamemnon] indulging himself while Clytemnestra waited back in Mycenae, grieving for their daughter. The dog-faced swine!" (George 2006: 351).

3.2.1 Substitution and addition of violation of *xenia*

Violation of *xenia* is a major source of *menis*, and in some cases is translated as personal betrayal in the target texts. In *The War at Troy* (Clarke 2004), even though the author attempts to establish a sense of exchange rules, including rules of hospitality, the focus of the "violation" of world order that happens when Paris "steals" Helen from Menelaus is framed as a personal betrayal of Menelaus by Paris:

Already he [Paris] had been troubled by the growing warmth of his affection for the Spartan king. Now he owed to that noble-hearted man the life of his dearest friend, and it had become unthinkable to contemplate betraying Menelaus by making off with the wife he so manifestly worshipped. (Clarke 2004: 134)

Nevertheless, Clarke attempts to add rather than completely transform this cause. In an enumeration of Paris' failings, Antenor says, "We know that he has violated an oath of friendship, violated the laws of hospitality and the sanctity of marriage, and brought years of hardship upon us all" (Clarke 2004: 330). In the concept of *xenia*, a "violation of an oath of friendship" falls under a "violation of the laws of hospitality": because Paris was *xenoi* in Menelaus' household, he was a "guest-friend" no matter whether Paris and Menelaus felt personal fondness for each other. The addition of emphasis on the "friendship" aspect of *xenia*, and its inclusion as a distinct cause from "violation of the laws of hospitality" provides the modern audience with a firmer grasp of the magnitude of Paris' transgression against Menelaus than merely telling the audience he had broken the rules of ritual guest customs. "Personal betrayal" is both a narrowing and broadening of the meaning of violating *xenia*. It broadens the meaning of the cause by separating the notions of "guest" and "friend"; it narrows the meaning by translating "severe social transgression" into "betrayal".

3.2.2 Substitution of dishonor with humiliation/emotional-psychological pain

The Homeric conception of honor and dishonor is different from a modern Western perspective. It bases on the realia of *timē* and of *kleos*. Although we have similar concepts in honor, excellence, and glory, the reasons for and of, the motivations for seeking or not seeking any of them, and the manners in which they are achieved and maintained are all significantly different.

In the target texts, the translations for the wrath caused by dishonor are, in some cases, translated into humiliation or emotional pain. In the first case, Agamemnon is attempting to humiliate Achilles by revoking his *geras*. But the seizing of Briseis is not dishonor in a society that does not measure eternal glory by the number and 'quality' of

slaves taken in conquest, or in *aresteias* (one-on-one battle between heroes), but by other considerations. When the target text audience reads the section of the *Iliad* in which Agamemnon demands Achilles ‘give’ him Briseis, the audience likely doesn’t read it for what Achilles viewed it as—Agamemnon injuring Achilles’ immortality. Briseis is Achilles’ *geras* (honor prize), the accumulation of which strengthens his *timē* (honor), and *timē* is the only way through which Achilles may hope to achieve great *kleos* (renown), and *kleos* is the only form of immortality a mortal can possess. Instead, we read it as Agamemnon abducting Achilles’ sexual-romantic partner (or in some target texts, victim) and causing emotional pain.

At the same time as explaining it, many of the target texts also reject this idea that it is an issue of dishonor. Instead, many explicitly or implicitly attribute the cause to either Achilles’ pride, Agamemnon’s pride, or both. Pride may be an adequate translation of *timē* here, but the fact is the target culture places connotations on pride that are not present in the *Iliad*. Pride, in English and in these contexts, may be closer to the idea of hubris—godlike arrogance. Whereas the dishonor Agamemnon does Achilles in the *Iliad* is an egregious breach of social obligations.

3.2 Repetition of grief

Achilles’ great grief for Patroclus is largely translated by repetition into the target texts. In some, perhaps a greater emphasis is placed on the *menis* that is directed towards Hector for the death of Patroclus. In *Ilium* (Simmons 2003), after the failure of the embassy to Achilles, Ajax says to Odysseus of Achilles: “Let’s leave him to his wrath” (Simmons 2003: 430). Later in the same scene, the time-travelling narrator Hockenberry reflects on his knowledge of the course of the *Iliad*: “[...] Patroclus will put on Achilles’ golden armor and rout the Trojans back until, in single combat with Hector, Patroclus is killed, his body violated and desecrated. *That* will bring Achilles out of his tent, filled with killing wrath” (Simmons 2003: 431). During Simmons’ narrator’s inspection and description of all the men at the Greek assembly, Patroclus is described as “the man-killer’s closest friend, whose death by Hector’s hand is destined to set off

the the true Wrath of Achilles” (Simmons 2003: 16). For this science-fiction adaptation of the *Iliad*, the target text distinguishes between “wrath” and “killing wrath” or “true Wrath” and prioritizes one over the other—dishonor incurs wrath, but “true Wrath” comes only from the grief of the gods, or the most godlike of men.

3.3 Addition of violation of bodily autonomy

In Linda Hutcheon’s *Theory of Adaptation* (2006), she notes that one of the features of transcultural adaptation is that they may reflect “changes in racial and gender politics” in the target text/adaptation anachronistic to the source text and culture (Hutcheon 2006: 147). For example, “Sometimes adapters purge an earlier text of elements that their particular cultures in time or place might find difficult or controversial” or an adaptation may “depress” the significance of an element of the source text in order to be more palatable to the target text’s audience (Hutcheon 2006: 147). In the case of the target texts, many of them explicitly condemn cultural features of the source culture. Specifically, the target texts express negative views towards the commodification of human beings, particularly in cases of the sexual enslavement of women.

Taboos against sexual slavery and rape in the target culture transforms what was a nonentity in the *Iliad* into a cause of wrath in some of the target texts. Notable for this are the adaptations that use a female narrator—in two cases, Helen, in one, Briseis, in others, chapters from original female characters (usually Trojan). In these especially there is direct acknowledgment of this commodification as well as condemnation of it. The condemnation favors narrative thought from a woman over speech acts. Although in some adaptations there is outright, spoken condemnation, as in *The Hittite* (Bova 2010):

Helen spread her arms. “Look about you, Lukka! You have eyes, use them! What woman would willingly live as the wife of an Achaian lord when she could be princess of Troy?”

“But your husband Menaleos is a king.”

“And an Achaian queen is still regarded less than her husband’s horses and dogs. A woman in Sparta is a slave, be she wife or concubine, there is no real difference. Do you think there would be women present in the great hall at Sparta

when an emissary arrives with a message for the king? Or at Agamemnon's Mycenae or Nestor's Pylos or even in Odysseos' Ithaca? No, Lukka. Here in Troy women are regarded as human beings. Here there is civilization." She seemed really angry. (Bova 2010: 106)

In the two "biographical" novels about Helen, she is at various times disgusted by the behavior of men towards women (especially the Greeks in general, and her brother-in-law Agamemnon in particular).

Acknowledgment is not absent from adaptations that do not favor a female point of view. In Achilles' grief in *The War at Troy* (Clarke 2004), the hero anachronistically imagines what life as a woman in their society might be like, and empathizes with women: "How would it be if he had been born a woman then? If instead of becoming a killer he had been fated like them to wait in the knowledge that some day some brash foreigner smelling of sweat and blood might burst through the door with rape on his mind?" (Clarke 2004: 375).

In *The Memoirs of Helen* (Elyot 2005), Helen prostitutes herself to Achilles in exchange for the return of Hector's body. This substitution uses the established "exchange" obligations of Homeric society which are shown earlier in the text, while also rejecting and condemning the idea that a person's body (especially a woman's) may be an object for exchange when it describes Helen's pain and humiliation. Helen thinks twice in the scene that Achilles has treated her as a "slave girl," a thought that takes special significance when learning that part of what made the exchange agreeable to Achilles is that Helen took particular care to mention that of all women she was most like a goddess, and the closest he would ever come to having sex with a goddess. "Having sex with a goddess" is one of the *menis*-incurring acts listed by Muellner. The scene concludes with a direct acknowledgment of this violation as a source of Helen's rage: "First I would redeem Hector's body. And then I would exact my revenge" (Elyot 2005: 245). It is interesting that this trend appears, and not entirely based on the target culture in that one of the major questions of the *Iliad* is commodification of hero's bodies—that is, whether killing or being killed as part of exchange obligation is "right".

In these, the question has broadened to encompass all people, not only warrior men of the ‘dominant’ culture but also women and/or “others” outside of the culture.

4. TRANSLATION OF MANIFESTATIONS

Violations of *timē* are not merely personal dishonor, and therefore the manifestations of the sanction *menis* are not limited to a single person:

[...]the emerging world of human beings depends to a large extent on a sense of social obligation. Human beings do not live alone, and it is not acceptable for leaders to destroy their own people [...] under any circumstances. While Achilles tries to rectify a perceived breach in the divine order, which traditionally rests on well-distributed *timai*, he becomes himself a threat to the emerging order and stability of human society. (Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 131)

4.1 Nature / the gods

Menis is invoked when there is cosmic, universal damage as a result of social/religious breach of taboo. Therefore, we may see the entire world “out of balance” in the form of natural destruction. What is crucial in the manifestations of *menis* is that there is wrongness on a grand scale reflecting the damage to the entire cosmic order: “During the period of wrath [...] the boundaries between men and gods become unstable, the very elements such as fire and water enter into the fighting, and men even attack the gods” (Thompson 2004: 56). In narrative, it is most explicit in pestilence and disease which is natural in reality but is presented as the manifestation of the *menis* of the god Apollo.

The story of Laomedon is recounted in *The War at Troy* (Clarke 2004). Laomedon is the father of Priam and grandfather of Paris and Hector, who attempts to cheat the gods: “The gods were not slow to take their revenge. In his aspect of a mouse-god, Apollo visited a plague upon Troy, while Earthshaker Poseidon unleashed a huge sea-monster to terrorize its coastline” (Clarke 2004: 36). Here *menis* is directly its manifestation as ‘revenge,’ and also ties into Apollo’s *menis* manifesting as plague in the *Iliad*.

The attribution of the plague to Apollo as a manifestation of *menis* is not

completely repeated in the target texts. For one thing, “One central mechanism at work in the construction of meaning is that of *inference*, and thus prediction of the consequences of intentions and events” (Grandjean et al 2008: 192) because “Myth depends on a fundamental feature of the human mind, namely the tendency to infer meaning to natural phenomena, thus establishing a link between the actions of gods and men. One important aspect of this is the perception and attribution of causality, which results in feelings of responsibility or expectations arising from actions” (Grandjean et al 2008: 193). The target text audience then must be given reason to infer that plague comes from Apollo; this involves earlier translation of Agamemnon’s refusal to ransom Chryseis and explanation of ransoming obligations. The target audience, without in-text addition and substitution, will not link Agamemnon refusing to ransom a slave with widespread pestilence, and “[...] reactions to disaster, with a view to limiting the damage or preventing a recurrence, depend largely on the identification of a causal agent and the perception of the disastrous event as being ‘justified’ (Grandjean et al. 2008: 198).”

4.1.1 Deletion and repetition of water manifestations

In *Iliad*, one of the important signs of Achilles’ unrelenting *menis* is the episode in which he literally fights a river. This event occurs directly before Achilles’ slaying of Hector. The river Scamander itself, anthropomorphized as a god, rises against him in protest for all the bodies he is discarding into it. It is in this scene that Achilles captures twelve Trojan warriors to be sacrificed on Patroclus’ bier: “twelve young Trojans / he rounded up from the river, took them all alive / as the blood-price for Patroclus’ death” (Fagles 1990: 21.30-32). He then encounters the Trojan warrior Lycaon, whose life he had previously spared at some point during the war, instead selling him as a slave in Lemnos, where someone paid his ransom and he returned to Troy (Fagles 1990: 21.45-75). In the river, they meet again and Lycaon attempts to prolong his life by supplicating to Achilles, embracing Achilles’ knees in ritual gesture. To hug the knees of the one whom you were supplicating was the most powerful gesture of supplication in Archaic Greece, demonstrating the supplicant’s “humility and desperation” (Pedrick

1982: 125). When Thetis supplicated Zeus to avenge Achilles earlier in the epic she knelt at his feet and hugged his knees. Upon encountering Achilles in the river, “Lycaon burst out with a winging prayer: “Achilles! / I hug your knees—mercy!—spare my life! / I am a suppliant, Prince, you must respect me!” (Fagles 1990: 21.84-86). Achilles replies “Fool, / don’t talk to me of ransom. No more speeches. / Before Patroclus met his destiny, true, / it warmed my heart a bit to spare some Trojans / [...] / But now not a single Trojan flees his death” (Fagles 1990: 21. 111-116).

In this scene, then, we have several important aspects in representing the *menis* of Achilles. There are the manifestations of bodily desecration through human sacrifice, the outright refusal of supplication rights, and dishonor of godly authority in several ways. Achilles selecting men to be sacrificed in what is the only instance of human sacrifice (directly contained) within the epic (this is godlike: to kill in war is one thing, sacrifice of people is something gods do). Achilles refusing to respect the rights of a suppliant. This is a huge breach of social exchange rules, breaking taboo of how superior should treat an inferior. He also directly denies any opportunity for Trojans to ransom, arguably an even larger breach of taboo and calling back to Agamemnon’s refusal to ransom Chryseis which brought the wrath of Apollo down upon the Greeks and started the entire *Iliad*. Achilles is also dishonoring his own divine heritage in a way. His goddess mother, Thetis, is a sea nymph. Though the river is freshwater and the sea is salt water, he is still polluting water the way he is polluting himself. Achilles literally fights a god. While heroes and gods have fought before in the epic (Aphrodite was even wounded by a mortal hero) it is different here in that Achilles has gone into the river (the god) and not met the god in disguise on the field of battle but fought the god as another god would fight him. Achilles has become so godlike in his *menis*, even more godlike than he already was, that he fights nature. Achilles is causing such destruction that he is fighting nature, the whole universe.

The target texts largely seem to omit this episode entirely, or omit its significance as a manifestation of *menis*. Some of the target texts include Achilles’ near

drowning but do not code it as the important episode of *menis* that it is in the *Iliad*.

To what purpose? The reason appears to be twofold: 1) there is a strong taboo against human sacrifice in modern Western culture, and 2) there is no cultural concept of the rights of a supplicant, or of ransoming etiquette. To include this as a manifestation of wrath would involve simultaneously breaching a taboo in the target culture, having to explain aspects or concepts of the source culture, and finally establish breaking that source culture concept is taboo.

There are three notable exceptions among the target texts to the deletion of Achilles' battle against the river, the repetition of this manifestation in Cook, Clarke, and Miller.

When the river roars at him Achilles jumps in, ready to take him on. Scamander clasps him, grabs him by the throat, and rises in a tower over his head.

Like a slab of rock over his head.

Like his funeral pile heaped over his head.

Water, the stuff of his mother, is now so heavy. (Cook 2001: 35)

He is carried on the river of his own blood, mighty as Scamander, storming the channels of his body. He is carried to the place where the river is sucked into a twist and the other river begins. (Cook 2001: 58)

4.1.2 Repetition of fire manifestations

The near omission of water manifestations of *menis* emphasizes the tendency of the target texts to rely on fire as the index of divine wrath. Yet there are still significant changes from the source text in the manifestation of this wrath.

One of the changes is deletion of corpse fires. The image of corpses, piled and burning, is a striking one. Corpse fires are a fire manifestation often omitted in the target texts as part of the manifestations of Achilles' *menis*. When corpse fires are included, they are usually a sign of Apollo's *menis* rather than Achilles'. This manifestation seems to be an obvious sequence of cause and effect indicating a god's wrath: the god causes disease in animals and then men, they die, their bodies are so numerous and dangerous they must be burnt without proper respect for the men. A version of "corpse fires"

imagery does appear in the representations of human sacrifice in a few of the target texts (most prominently, Bova's 2010 *The Hittite*). Where in the source texts, the corpse fires are 'divine' in that death in war is a consequence from gods, this version is a more mortal than divine manifestation in that the practice is depicted as wrongdoing by mortals rather than demanded by the gods or cosmic order. It is condemned narratively in the target texts explicitly.

A ubiquitous manifestation of fire as *menis* is the imagery of fire in a god's or hero's eyes—these are the famous “glowing eyes” of Homer's epics. This manifestation is also closely linked with the manifestation of bodily desecration. In the *Iliad*, the eyes of heroes flash, or burn, when enraged: “Agamemnon—furious, his dark heart filled to the brim, / blazing with anger now, his eyes like searing fire. / With a sudden, killing look he wheeled on Calchas first” (Fagles 1.102-103). This is fire-in-the-eyes imagery is broadly translated into the target texts; nearly every target text describes fire in someone's eyes as a way of demonstrating that person's rage. Fiery eyes may be actually be a deletion or lessening of meaning from the source language, though. Classicist Daniel Turkeltaub demonstrates that in Homeric Greek, there is both a syntactic and semantic difference in how eyes can “blaze.” Verbal form (“his eyes glow”) indicates the anger of a mortal hero; adjectival form (“his glowing eyes”) is associated with gods and with sight, especially divine sight (Turkeltaub 2005: 157). In the interlingual translation this distinction was not preserved, and it makes sense that the association of heroic “fiery” rage in the eyes broadened to include gods. The conceptual metaphor “eyes are the containers for emotions” is a long time metaphorical convention based more off of human experience than particular regard of the archaic Greeks (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 51). In *Metaphors We Live By*, cognitive scientists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson even cite the example, “His eyes were *filled* with anger” as an instance of this conceptual metaphor.

4.1.3 Repetition and deletion of pestilence⁶

In the *Iliad*, Apollo coming over the land like darkness and shooting silver arrows that are plague is described by the narrator almost cinematically:

First he went after the mules and the circling hounds, then let go
a tearing arrow against the men themselves and struck them.
The corpse fires burned everywhere and did not stop burning.
(*Iliad* 1.50-52; Lattimore 1951: 60)

First he went for the mules and the circling dogs but then,
Launching a piercing shaft at the men themselves,
He cut them down in droves—
And the corpse fires burned on, night and day, no end in sight.
(*Iliad* 1.57-60; Fagles 1990: 79)

The plague appears as a manifestation of *menis* in several of the target texts. Most of the target texts do not directly show Apollo inflicting his *menis*. In *The Song of Achilles* (Miller 2011) there is a description of plague and its ramifications without a scene of Apollo directly inflicting it upon the Achaeans. The narrator, Patroclus, and Achilles, reach the conclusion that the plague originates from Apollo (and this conclusion is then affirmed by Achilles' goddess mother). The plague and its effects are indices of godly wrath: "Our suspicions tumbled out, confirmed in a thousand ways, that this was not a natural plague, not the creeping spread of haphazard disease. It was something else, sudden and cataclysmic as the snuffing of Aulis' winds. A god's displeasure" (Miller 2011: 261). There exists much metaphrase and imagery repeated from the source text in the target texts in the translation of pestilence. This may be because the imagery of first animals, and then humans, dropping of illness is powerful and universal in some ways. However, the repetition of imagery, especially in the metaphrase of the spread of the plague from donkey to dog to man is an implicit acknowledgement of the plague as Apollo's *menis*. In the *Iliad*, the heroes do not perceive Apollo shooting the plague but it is described for the audience. In *The Song of*

⁶ See appendix 2 for a table of the repetition transformations of the manifestation of pestilence.

Achilles (Miller 2011), as in most of the target texts, the text does not explicitly depict Apollo at all. Instead, only the effects of pestilence are present and interpreted as “arrows” of Apollo.

A major substitution in the manifestation of pestilence as godly *menis* is the pattern of target texts dismissing the involvement of Apollo (and the gods in general) in the outbreak of disease. This occurs even in texts when gods are physically present in other places in the text. Such is the case in *Ilium* (Simmons 2003): “[...] in the past few days it has become an epidemic, slaying more Achaean and Danaan heroes than the defender of Ilium have in months. I suspect it is typhus. The Greeks are sure it is the anger of Apollo” (Simmons 2003: 3). Another such substitution is that the pestilence is a manifestation of *menis*, but it is human wrath, not divine. Historian Adrienne Mayor suggests raises the possibility that the plague of the *Iliad* is early biological warfare:

Weapons based on poisons, contagion, and combustibles are, of course, the prototypes of modern biological weapons and chemical incendiaries. Amazingly, these elemental agents were already combined in the ancient imagination more than three thousand years before the invention of modern germ warfare, napalm, and nuclear conflagrations. (Mayor 2003: 60)

The novels of Elyot and George have substituted the plague as the *menis* of Apollo for the *menis* of the Trojans through biological warfare. Historian Adrienne Mayor asks if it is possible that “[...]some priests in temples of Apollo or Athena the keepers of lethal biological material that could be weaponized in times of crisis?” (Mayor 2003: 136) If so, then “One can imagine that a garment or other item contaminated with, say, dried smallpox matter, could have been sealed away from heat, light, and air in a golden casket in the temple of Apollo in Babylon, until a time of need. The items could maintain “weapons-grade” virulence for many years.” (Mayor 2003: 136). Plague would still be *menis* in this case, human *menis* rather than a god’s, but no less brutal:

“[...] do you know of poisonous garments?”
 “Do you mean smeared with poison?” asked Priam.
 Gelanor laughed. “No, not that. I mean, garments that have rubbed up against

victims of plague or other diseases. They have the power to impart the disease to healthy people.”

“No!” I [Helen] cried. I could not permit such to be used against my own countrymen.

“You prefer the arrows of Apollo, then? [...] They strike here, there, to no purpose for either side? The cruel god of plague? If a man must die of plague, why should it not be for a purpose? [...] Shall we not harness Apollo as well?” (George 2006: 344)

And then the pestilence came.

Although the people of Ilios were taken in great number as well, the Achaeans claimed that we were responsible, that a Hittite merchant admitted to their encampment, his wagon piled high with finely woven, brightly colored robes and attractive trinkets designed to delight the vanity of the camp followers and concubines, had contaminated his goods with plague. (Elyot 2005: 207)

4.2 Repetition of mutilation and body desecration

The violence, gore, and mass death of the *Iliad* are uniformly repeated in the target texts. What is worth mentioning is that in both the source text and the target texts, “death” is included in the notion of body desecration. It involves a dehumanization of the warriors that is chilling. Especially in the case of the death and desecration of Hector, who symbolizes his entire city. Achilles’ slaughter of Trojans is different from that of the other Achaeans in that “Achilles is a ravaging hybrid, a man-beast-god driven by an all-consuming desire for death and blood of mortals” (Neal 2006: 33). Achilles’ “insatiable appetite for the blood of men—no longer simply a metaphor for fighting fury—is both self-consuming and self-destructive (Neal 2006: 33).

4.2.1 Repetition of death and desecration of Hector⁷

The death of Hector is both included in every target text, and is a manifestation of *menis* in every target text. There are several markers of this, and a major one is the exchange between Hector and Achilles just before Hector’s death. Hector requests the winner allow the loser’s body be ransomed back to his people: “Hector promises an

⁷ See appendix 3 for Lattimore (1951) and Fagles (1990) translations of this scene.

honourable deal: the winner will treat the other's body with respect and allow his people to fetch it for decent burial" (Cook 2001: 39). In a longer version, the target text author draws out the request:

"Achilles..." Hector's words bubbled from his mouth in a froth of blood. "I am dying beside my city walls. Let them bury me. Let them take me within the gate. Don't leave my body to rot. The birds will peck it. The dogs...Let them bury me, or the dogs will suck my bones. My father will give you gold. My mother will throw her jewels from the walls for you...I implore you, give them back my body." (Geras 2000: 115)

The second part of this encounter's repetition is Achilles' refusal. In a few target texts Achilles' refusal is tacit: a purposeful unacknowledgement of Hector's request. In most, he explicitly tells Hector he will not obey the rules of ransoming and allow Hector's people to mourn him properly. He will leave him unburied and let animals consume him. The image of dogs and birds as a manifestation of wrath is included even in the very first lines of epic—the *menis* of Achilles made the Greek warriors "food for birds and dogs". Later, once Achilles' *menis* has turned from Agamemnon to Hector, Achilles tells Hector: "The dogs and birds will rend you—blood and bone!" (Fagles 22.417). Repeated in the target texts⁸:

"You killed Patroclus," Achilles replied, out of breath, panting from the heat. "You killed him, and I loved him. I can't forgive that. Never. Die. And I wish the dogs the joy of your carcass." (Geras 2000: 115)

Achilles looks at the man who killed Patroclus and feels the hatred spread through his body, slowly, luxuriously, like cream. A sumptuous hatred that leaves no part of him unfilled.

'No Hector. We meet as animals. What's left of you will go to the dogs.'

As *Iliad* translator Robert Fagles remarks, "This is how gods hate" (1990: 56). Once Hector is dead, the episode intensifies as a manifestation by Achilles' brutal godlike disregard for the Trojan warrior's body.

⁸ See appendix 4 for a table detailing the repetition and substitution of the 'dogs and birds' motif within the manifestation of bodily desecration.

“Half-blind with rage, Achilles jumps down from the car, hoists the corpse by its feet to the axlebar, and with a brutal swiftness loops the thong three times round the bar, jerks it firm, then savagely knots it. He is dealing with a sack of bones. As the dogs know, who yelp and howl at having been kept so long from what they would tear at.” (Malouf 2009: 32)

The target texts are also clear in that Hector, once he is dead, is not merely Hector: he is the entire city of Troy. He is foreshadowing the fall of the city. Andromache states that Hector has left his body, the *menis* Achilles is now inflicting is on the city of Troy as a whole, not one man:

My husband’s body cannot feel what is being done to it. Only we can feel it: the pain and the shame. My body, too, is harnessed to a chariot, and every morning when Phoebus Apollo begins his journey across the sky, that’s where I’ll be: dragged through the day until the night releases me. And this torture will continue as long as I go on waking up each morning. It will never end. (Geras 2002: 136)

The imagery of “fawns and hunting dogs recall the days of peace” and the implication is that now “the roles are reversed for both the Trojans and their champion Hector” in that now they are the hunted rather than the hunters, an idea which truly “drives home their plight” (Newman 1986: 11). In *The War at Troy* (Clarke 2004), Clarke repeats and expands on the motif of Achilles as a predatory animal with Hector’s body: “Achilles untied the battered corpse from the rail of his chariot and threw it down by the bier where Patroclus lay. But he felt less like a hunter returned from a kill than an awkward boy seeking to make clumsy reparation for some unrightable wrong he had done” (Clarke 2004: 371).

4.2.2 Addition of eye mutilation

Returning to the fire imagery related to wrath in the eyes, it is significant that there is substantial addition of the threat of eye mutilation, or actual eye mutilation, in target texts. In at least half of the target texts, there are scenes of *menis* manifesting as injury, or threat of injury to the eyes of mortals. In *Ilium* (Simmons 2003) when the mortals turn against the gods, Zeus’ *menis* is so stirred he drops a nuclear weapon on the

mortals, commanding them: “**YOU DARE TO DEFY ME?**” boomed Zeus’s voice across the length and breadth of the fields and shore and city where the armies were gathered. “**BEHOLD THE CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR HUBRIS!**” (Simmons 2003: 620). After commanding the warriors to “look” at what they have wrought, the narration emphasizes the damage to their eyes, stating: “The flash, when it came, blinded thousands” (Simmons 2003: 620). While the target texts do translate the metaphor of eyes containing emotion, the deliberate mutilation of eyes that appears in so many of the target texts, it seems the translations focus on another conceptual metaphor described by Lakoff and Johnson: “seeing is touching; eyes are limbs” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 51). The eyes, as the limbs which “touch” and connect a person with the world, are what are harmed when *menis* is incurred: trapping someone in isolation, irrevocably away and apart from the world.

4.2.3 Repetition, addition, and deletion of human sacrifice and cannibalism

The *Iliad* is full of metaphorical human sacrifice to the gods. All the men fighting, being injured, dying, being mutilated, are sacrifices to the gods. The men are becoming more like animals in their behavior, more predatory, and they are compared to animals that hunger for human flesh. “Achilles is a ravaging hybrid, a man-beast-god driven by an all-consuming desire for death and blood of mortals” (Neal 2006: 33).

There is one instance of human sacrifice in the *Iliad*, which we encountered earlier in examination of the major water-related manifestation of *menis* in which Achilles fights a river. This is: “twelve young Trojans / he rounded up from the river, took them all alive / as the blood-price for Patroclus’ death” (Fagles 1990: 21.30-32). This exact scenario is repeated in The Memoirs of Helen of Troy from the point of view of the side being sacrificed: “The great Achaean vowed, too, that he would behead twelve young Troyans and pile their mangled corpses on his kinsman’s pyre as a fitting tribute of his love” (Elyot 2005: 231). Then later, “True to his dastardly promise, Achilles slit the throats of twelve Trojan youths and piled their bodies atop the pyre.[...] The loss of twelve boys, innocents in the conflict, further angered and saddened us.”

(Elyot 2005: 236-237).

The Hittite (Bova 2010) involves extensive addition of human sacrifice. Upon the Achaean victory of the Trojan War, the kings and chief men among them organize large human sacrifices as part of their thanks to the gods for victory, and in preparation to return back to their homes as there was not enough resources to transport the slaves they had taken during the course of the war back with them (Bova 2010: 271-272).

Standing off to one side of them were the human sacrifices, every man over the age of twelve who had been captured alive, their hands tightly bound behind their backs, their ankles hobbled. [...] The victims stood silently, grimly, knowing full well what awaited them but neither begging for mercy nor bewailing their fate. I suppose they each knew nothing was going to alter their destiny.

Then I saw a different group, women and boys: slaves from the camp. They were going to be sacrificed, too, I realized. Agamemnon had no intention of bringing them back across the sea with him. Gold, yes. Fine robes and weapons and jewelry that would add to his treasury. But not the slaves he had kept at camp, except for the royal Trojan women. (Bova 2010: 271)

Human sacrifice is not the greatest taboo alluded to in the *Iliad*, however. Throughout the source text, in predatory animal similes are used reference to the blood-thirst of the Achaean warriors: “[...] warriors in the *Iliad* are compared to lions who would feast on other kinds of animals” (Neal 2006: 32). It is a metaphorical convention of the source text that warriors are animals, as is noted by Neal: “Men are compared to blood-hungry animals, suggesting that the desire is somewhat abstract [...] A metaphor for fighting and killing, the bestial consumption of blood remains just that, a metaphor” (Neal 2006: 32). But in scene of Hector's death, this metaphor becomes less abstract.

In the *Iliad*, Achilles expresses a desire to feast on the death and blood of his own kind” (Neal 2006: 33). In the confrontation between Achilles and Hector in the *Iliad*, Achilles threatens Hector with the possibility that he will cannibalize Hector's corpse: “No more entreating of me, you dog, by knees or parents. / I wish only that my spirit and fury would drive me / to hack your meat away and eat it raw for the things that

/ you have done to me” (Lattimore 1951: 22.345-348). In another translation: “Would to god / my rage, my fury would drive me now / to hack your flesh and eat you raw” (Fagles 1990: 22.408-409). Here, what is most striking is Achilles' verbalization of his desire. That Achilles “articulates his blood-lust” and does so “without the mediation of the narrator [...] or through the use of similes” is the only instance of direct threat of cannibalism in the *Iliad* (Neal 2006: 32). This verbalized threat is meant to demonstrate just how overwhelming, all-consuming, and godlike Achilles' manifestation of *menis* as blood-thirst has become. Not all of the target texts translate this manifestation of *menis*. Cannibalism is inarguably, however, still taboo within Western society. In cases where the threat is deleted from the narrative one cannot argue it is due to ‘untranslatability’ of the cannibalism taboo. The target texts which do translate this manifestation do so as both an implicit and explicit threat. The implicit threat builds off the oft-repeated imagery of animals devouring corpses by the comparison of Achilles to an animal, and by also coding him with ‘bestial’ traits. There are also explicit threats of cannibalism in some of the target texts. In Miller’s novel, the explicit threat also builds off the idea of Achilles as having become animalistic in his rage: “There are no bargains between lions and men. I will eat you raw” (Miller 2011: 344). The threat of cannibalism in Achilles’ butchering of Hector is an important manifestation of wrath because it, arguably more than any other moment, shows the breakdown of the cosmic hierarchy that separates gods from men, and men from animals: in this moment Achilles’ *menis* has blurred the distinction between all three.

4.3 Inaction

But he raged on, grimly camped by his fast fleet,
 the royal son of Peleus, the swift runner Achilles.
 Now he no longer haunted the meeting grounds
 where men win glory, now he no longer went to war
 but day after day he ground his heart out, waiting there,
 yearning, always yearning for battle cries and combat.
 (Fagles 1.581-586)

While many of the target texts include Achilles’ inaction in the narrative, much

of the meaning is deleted because the target text author's translation of *menis* as active rage. Achilles' rage is not only in action but in lack of action. *Menis*, as both the emotion and the consequence of violating social-divine order, is as much a paralytic as it is a catalyst to action. It is vital to the *Iliad* that Achilles' withdrawal from the war is understood as a manifestation, if not one of the primary manifestations, of his *menis*. Achilles is in a state of "psychological standstill corresponding to his physical withdrawal" after the quarrel with Agamemnon and "whenever he is referred to throughout these books, he is described as still being unrelentingly angry with Agamemnon" (Most 2003: 64). Achilles' inaction is, in fact, inseparable from the deaths and injuries of the Greeks. The "visible dimension of pain" of the Greeks that is demonstrated during Achilles' absence from battle is a direct result of his absence because "Achilles' own vengeance [...] involves not active assault, but the withdrawal of his protection" (Holmes 2007: 59). It is fitting that his refusal to help causes suffering for his fellow warriors, because when he was bearing the brunt of Agamemnon's *menis* none of them acted: "If the Greek generals were suffering now they had only themselves to blame. He and all his followers, including Patroclus, and his father Peleus, and their homeland Phthia, had been subjected to an outrageous affront" (Malouf 2009: 17). Achilles' "withdrawal of protection" (Holmes 2007: 59) is as integral to his *menis* as the mutilation, death, and bodily desecration of the Greeks which the inaction facilitates.

However, many of the target texts do not emphasize the inaction of Achilles as a primary manifestation of his rage. For instance, Cook's adaptation of inaction takes up less than a whole page. It depicts this as a pocket of peaceful time for Achilles and his Myrmidons: "And Achilles remembers that he can choose. He lays off his men and folds his arms. The fifty beached orange ships frame a village of soldiers at ease" and "They throw dice, wrestle, fish, tell stories. Patroclus and Achilles dance" (Cook 2001: 31). This is not the "unrelenting anger" (Most 2003: 64) of Achilles. This depiction makes Achilles' inaction as an easy, lazy vacation rather than a form of his inexhaustible, inhuman wrath that is a source of "social catastrophe" (Graziosi, Haubold 2005: 130). In

The Song of Achilles (Miller 2011), Achilles' inaction is primarily a method of stalling his fated death. In most of the target texts, inaction is deleted as the powerful form of the sanction of *menis* that the source culture would have viewed it as. It was the withdrawal of favor from the most godlike of men, practically withdrawal of favor from a god.

4.3.1 Repetition of the embassy to Achilles

In the *Iliad*, Achilles' refusal to return to battle after Agamemnon sends an envoy emphasizes the strength in the manifestation of inaction. Many of the target texts repeat this episode within the manifestation of inaction. One depiction which does not erode the significance of the embassy and its role in Achilles' inaction is in *The War at Troy* (Clarke 2004). During the embassy to Achilles, Phoenix reminds Achilles that "A man should be wary of refusing an apology when it's offered. He can offend the gods that way and bring a worse fate down on his head" (Clarke 2004: 342), substituting Achilles refusing an apology for Achilles refusing ransom. In this same episode, Ajax expresses confusion and disgust at Achilles' refusal to return to battle, saying: "I've always loved and admired you, son of Peleus, but this stubborn petulance baffles me. Even in cases of murder, men will accept blood money to end a feud, yet here — in a stupid quarrel over a woman — you turn your back on your friends and refuse to hear reason" (Clarke 2004: 343). In this same scene, Ajax expresses the view of a modern audience, voicing a modern opinion: that Achilles is being hateful to refuse when he is offered so much recompense, including the woman the quarrel was supposedly over. But this view fails to take into account the social system in which the event took place. Achilles is upset not only over the 'stealing' of Briseis but over what he sees as a dangerous violation of their entire society.

5. TRANSLATIONS OF APPEASEMENT

It has been noted that it is important how wrath is appeased: “the way in which the hero’s wrath ends proves to be as important as the punishment of his enemies” (Rutherford 1996: 31). Achilles achieves “heroic revenge” with the death of Hector (Rutherford 1996: 31). Yet the story of Achilles does not end with his revenge on Hector, because revenge on Hector does not repair the damage that was inflicted on social and divine order.

5.1 Repetition of yielding to greater *menis*

One way through which *menis* may be relieved is by yielding to a greater *menis*. “Greater” *menis* in both the sense of the *menis* of a more powerful hero or god, and “greater” in the sense of a *menis* more intense within the same hero or god. The *menis* of Achilles incurred by Agamemnon falls in this category, in a way, because Achilles reconciles with Agamemnon not because he believes that their social values have been restored, but because he feels they have been broken even more egregiously and his *menis* has deepened and shifted attention. For Achilles, “The reconciliation with Agamemnon and the Greeks was a mere formality” and though his *menis* is no longer manifesting against Agamemnon and the Greeks, he has not returned to his former state and is “still cut off from humanity, a prisoner of his self-esteem, his obsession with honor—the imposition of his identity on all men and all things” (Knox 1990: 56).

Even the *menis* of godlike heroes must yield to the *menis* of true gods. Achilles’ *menis* does so in the *Iliad*, when he is told he must stop mutilating Hector’s body and receive Priam as a beggar. The target texts repeat this threat of greater *menis*, and Achilles’ grudging yielding. For example, in *Hand of Fire* (Starkston 2014), Achilles says that: “If it is Zeus’ command, I cannot refuse. Let Priam come with ransom, and I will relinquish Hector’s body” (Starkston 2014: 281). Achilles, of course, can refuse Priam’s ransom; but to do so would create even further calamity in the universe. The target texts translate a man who is not appeased but recognizes, at last, his mortal limits when faced with the prospect of incurring the *menis* of the king of the gods:

‘It’s Hector’s body that I’ve come for. There was no question of fear.’

This irritates Achilles.

‘Don’t give me that. It takes three young, strong men to knock back the bolt on my gate. I know you’ve been helped by a god. I’ve had my instructions too. It’s Zeus’ wish that I give you the body and that’s why you’ll get it.’ (Cook 2001: 45)

5.2 Repetition of appeasement through pity and empathy

The “will of Zeus,” though, only goes so far. Achilles allows Priam to come before him and embrace his knees in the *Iliad* because Zeus, in his capacity of the patron of suppliants, demands Achilles do so. It is not true appeasement of wrath, and it is not translated as such. True appeasement, in the *Iliad* and in many of the target texts, comes in the genuine connection through shared grief between Priam and Achilles, and the arousal of pity Priam stirs in Achilles. By having Priam supplicate himself before Achilles, “Rather than making Achilles relent as a result of compensation or apology, Homer allows violent revenge to give way to pity and magnanimity” (Rutherford 1996: 31). In some of the target texts this pity and empathy repeats: “Some cleansing emotion that flooded through him—when?—when Priam first appeared to him in the figure of his father? — has cleared his heart of the smoky poison that clogged and thickened its every emotion so that whatever he turned his gaze on was clouded and dark” (Malouf 2009: 190).

5.3 Repetition and deletion of ritual

Of the eight target texts that include the ransoming of Hector’s body, seven include some form of ritual afterwards: sharing of a meal between Achilles and Priam, a funeral for Hector, or both. Meal taking rituals and death rituals, while they differ greatly across place and time, are recognizably methods of appeasement. Their repetition in nearly all episodes of the ransoming of Hector may be the same reason for their deletion (lessening): ritual is a universal human feature. The exact details are unimportant; the acts are understood by all and therefore need no further explanation.

	Includes scene of the ransoming of Hector's body	Includes scene of the sharing of a meal between Priam and Achilles	Includes scene of the funeral of Hector
Bova, <i>The Hittite</i> (2010)	No	No	No
Clarke, <i>The War at Troy</i> (2004)	Yes	Yes	No
Cook, <i>Achilles</i> (2003)	Yes	Yes	No
Elyot, <i>The Memoirs of Helen of Troy</i> (2004)	Yes	Yes	Yes
George, <i>Helen of Troy</i> (2006)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Geras, <i>Troy</i> (2002)	Yes	Yes	No
Malouf, <i>Ransom</i> (2009)	Yes	Yes	No
Miller, <i>The Song of Achilles</i> (2011)	Yes	No	No
Simmons, <i>Ilium</i> (2003)	No	No	No
Starkston, <i>Hand of Fire</i> (2014)	Yes	Yes	No

Table 2. Repetition of ritual in the target texts.

5.3.1 Repetition of sharing of meal between Achilles and Priam

Achilles' desire for vengeance on Hector is "compounded with an explicit refusal

to eat and drink, and to take part in the communal ritual of meal taking” (Neal 2006: 31). “Achilles’ appetite for food and drink are replaced by a need for vengeance, represented as a desire for [phonos (murder, slaughter)] and blood” (Neal 2006: 32). In *Achilles* (Cook 2001), we see direct acknowledgment that it is this sharing of food with Priam, which comes after Achilles’ agreement to ransom Hector’s body, that is appeasement of his *menis* (called ‘Fury’ by Cook):

Filled with the comfort of food and wine, Priam is at peace. The grief and hatred that have been driving him, step down. Pain slides off and his limbs relax and warm to being at rest. He looks at his host and finds him magnificent. He admires, though cannot like, Achilles' nerved face, each feature outlined clear. The huge hands that can fashion as wells as place a spear. Achilles too is soothed. The Fury that has gripped him, worried at him, gnawed him, thwacked him against her cavern's walls, has put him down. (Cook 2001: 47)

5.3.2 Deletion of funerary rites of Hector

The funeral of Hector takes up the entirety of book 24, the last book, of the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* ends with the funeral of Hector. It is a ritual correction of the “balance” which was disturbed by the *menis* of Achilles. meaning is significantly lessened, and in some cases omitted entirely.

More than a cursory mention of Hector’s funerary rites feature in only two of the target texts: Elyot’s *The Memoirs of Helen of Troy* (2005) and George’s *Helen of Troy* (2006). Both of these adaptations, as implied by the titles, focus on Helen and take her point of view of the events of the *Iliad* exclusively. In book twenty-four of the *Iliad*, Helen is an active participant in funeral and helps to bring about the end of the cycle of *menis* by taking part in the ritual mourning of Hector. Within Homeric society, ritual mourning (specifically, the ritual mourning of women, the lamentation of women) “emphasises the importance of social relationships among human beings belonging to the same family, city and society” (Graziosi, Haubold 2005: 110). It is understandable why the funeral of Hector is repeated in novels that focus on Helen, then, but why is it

deleted from the other target texts? Possibly, it is simply the course of the adaptation, as in *Ilium* (Simmons 2003) in which Hector's funeral does not occur mainly because Hector does not die in the course of the novel.

5.4 Substitution in reestablishment of “balance” / “equivalency”

In the *Iliad*, the ransoming of Hector, and the ritual meal and death rites which follow are reestablishment of the social system. Their observance returns the world to its rightful order. These events finally halt the cycle of *menis* which Achilles has been trapped in since the incurring of his *menis* by Agamemnon, and the cycles of *menis* that has been proliferating since Apollo's *menis* was incurred. It is the reversal of Agamemnon's breach of *menis* for both taking Briseis and refusing to ransom Chryseis. The entire epic begins by the violation of social obligations and so it ends with social obligations being properly observed. Someone dear is taken from Chryses and Achilles, this violation is compounded with the violation on a societal level in the refusal to acknowledge reciprocal obligations of ransoming and distribution, both of which can be considered “equivalent exchange”.

Many of the target texts do try to preserve the spirit, if not the letter, of the Greek social system's “equivalent exchange.” In Hector's death scene in the *Iliad*, he begs Achilles to accept whatever ransom his parents will offer and allow them to take his body back to Troy for burial. Achilles replies:

Ransom?
 No man alive could keep the dog packs off you,
 not if they haul in ten, twenty times that ransomed
 and pile it here before me and promise fortunes more—
 no, and not even if the Dardan Priam should offer to weigh out
 your bulk in gold! (Fagles 1990: 22.410-416)

In *Helen of Troy* (George 2006), this scene repeats. As Hector is about to be killed by Achilles, he begs his body be returned to his family after his death. Achilles refuses, again repeating the scene of the *Iliad* by telling him he wouldn't accept the ransom if Priam and Hecuba paid out Hector' weight in gold. Later, then, once Priam

has gone to Achilles with a ransom, Achilles changes his mind. He will ransom Hector's body only for its weight in gold:

"I will release the body of Hector!" he [Achilles] cried. "But only for a ransom of his weight in gold. Your old king did not bring enough. More is needed!"

[...]

"Gold to balance the weight of Hector!" Achilles screamed.

[...]

"Release my son! Release him!" he [Priam] cried. "You agreed to release him. Last night, you swore you would. Keep your word!"

"Only with enough gold, old man. You brought too little. Do you not know how much your son weighs? Did you not even figure on the armor? I shall count it, add Trojan gold for every bit of my armor." (George 2004: 457)

Ransoming in this version is not a necessary social obligation; it is not an "equivalent exchange". It is a narrative distillation of Achilles' greed and cruelty. Achilles is not restoring the balance of social order by permitting Priam to ransom his son but instead "adding insult to injury" by forcing him to buy his son back. It is still, however, a sort of reestablishment of balance. Achilles, however vile his behavior, does accept exactly the ransom he initially swore he would never accept.

6. MODEL OF TARGET TEXTS

6.1 Overall pattern(s) of transformations

The transformations of repetition and substitution working in tandem are the bulk of the transformation operations between the source text and the target texts. Although repetition is cited more frequently in this analysis, it is, after all, “repetition with difference” that creates adaptation (Hutcheon 2006: 142). Delabastita writes that “deletion and addition go hand in hand” (1993: 36). In the target texts, the same may be said of repetition and substitution. The major “plot points” are repeated but those plot points have new meanings and associations substituted in. Deletion and addition emerge as natural byproducts within the repetition and substitution: the deletion of that which is not repeated, the addition of substitutions. These additions range from relatively small, such as emphasis on the mutilation of eyes in modern target texts, to highly significant, as in the case of addition of reactions of the characters to causes, manifestations, and appeasement of *menis*. Deletions tend to lessen the meaning of elements rather than entirely omit those elements, such as the “deletions” of ritual after the ransom of Hecor.

Concerning the larger patterns of the translation motif of *menis*, a pattern of the target texts emerges:

- *Menis* is realia.
- All the target texts use substitution operations and the homologous strategy to translate *menis* from source language to target language, but not necessarily from source code to target code.
- *Menis* and associated realia are translated in context to each other. Translating realia that is *menis* necessarily includes translating at least aspects of the realia of *menis*' context.
- A feature of the target texts are self-contained models of *menis* within the larger cycle of *menis*. These smaller models “mirror” the larger narrative. This is present in the source text.
- A feature of the target texts is reliance on “reaction” to translate *menis* in

its causes, manifestations and appeasements. By showing the reactions of the characters within the text, the author is giving the audience a model for their understanding of and reaction to *menis*.

6.2 Repetition and substitution of self-contained models of *menis* within the texts

In the *Iliad*, Apollo's *menis* serves as a model for Achilles' *menis*. "Apollo and Achilles both exercise the power of divine anger, directed at the same target (Agamemnon) and for the same cause" (Rabel 1990: 431).

In examining the presence of multiple wrath-scenarios in the *Iliad*, it is useful to consider Lotman's discussion of "mirrors" in a text. Lotman writes that "Replication is the simplest way of introducing code organization into the sphere of conscious structural construction" however "we immediately confront that replication in the mirror is never simple repetition" (Lotman 1981: 45). In the reproduction created by a mirror, there is also inherently distortion (Lotman 1981: 46). Lotman names the literary version of a mirror as a "double," though the principle is the same:

The literary counterpart of the mirror motif is the double. As though behind a mirror—that strange model of the everyday world—the double is an alienated reflection of the character. Changing in accordance with the laws of mirror reflection...the image of the character, the double, represents a combination of features that enable us to perceive their invariant basis as well as changes (Lotman 1981: 46)

In the *Iliad*, Achilles' wrath is a "mirror" or "double" for Apollo's wrath and vice versa. "Apollo and Achilles both exercise the power of divine anger, directed at the same target (Agamemnon) and for the same cause (the theft of a woman)" (Rabel 1990: 431).

The translations of the *Iliad* all necessarily include some sort of acknowledgment of the cycle of Apollo's wrath. This series of events provides the foundation for the wrath of Achilles towards Agamemnon and even in the cases in which there is no explicit retelling of the events, their presence is still imperative to the understanding of Achilles' wrath. However, while many do contain acknowledgment of the god's *menis*,

many do not include the full series of cause to manifestation(s) to appeasement.

The target texts also contain some form of ‘self-contained wrath-scenarios’. While the majority of the novels contain the entirety of Apollo’s wrath towards Agamemnon, many of them also add other self-contained wrath cycles. In novels in which the whole of the Apollo wrath cycle is not related, there is still an exemplar for Achilles’ *menis*.

A noteworthy example of this phenomenon appears in Starkston’s *Hand of Fire*, the protagonist and narrator is Briseis. Prior to her capture by the Greeks and becoming a *geras* (special prize—that is, a sexual slave) to Achilles, Briseis serves as a priestess in her Luwian religion which worships different gods. In her capacity as priestess, one of Briseis’ official duties is to sing the story of the her healing goddess soothing the wrath of her warrior god consort after the other gods incite his wrath by taking his honor:

The assembly of the gods has taken something from him—his honor. He will not tolerate the insult. He lifts his sword and races from the gods’ assembly. She follows him, hovering above the ground. All the fields and houses burn as he passes. The great river dries up, withdrawing from its banks, now blasted and blackened. [...] She realizes she is the tiny bee Kamrusepa sent to sting Telipinu so he remembers who he is and what he must do. Then she must comfort him and bring him back. [...] She stings the handsome god’s feet and hands. She must stop his rage. She soothes the stings with her wax, then rubs more wax on his shoulders and chest to calm him, but he burns it away. She flies around him over and over, seven times seven. The flames begin to damp down and amber pours from the wax, down his face and chest, coating him in a glistening shimmer of sweetness. Now she can hear her words, “I burn away your anger, I sweeten your heart.”

She is no longer a bee, but herself again. He looks into her eyes, lays down his sword and touches her face. Under his fingers, her hair bursts into flames but she is unhurt. She hands him a cup of honey-sweet wine and his hand wraps around hers. They share the drink. (Starkston 2014: 87)

Starkston connects the story of Apollo’s *menis* in the *Iliad* with different context, that of the Hittite god Telipinu. This is a real Hittite myth of a god’s fury, but it was in no way connected to the *menis* of Apollo, Achilles, or the *Iliad* in general until Starkston’s inclusion of it in her novel. The inclusion draws obvious parallels between

the god Telipinu and the hero Achilles, but more significant is that it draws obvious parallels between the goddess Kamrusepa and the novel's protagonist, Briseis. On another narrative level, Briseis in *Hand of Fire* herself undergoes a series of events that mirrors those of Achilles' in the *Iliad*. Briseis is dishonored by the priestess-servant Zitha, whom she considers to be her inferior (as Achilles is dishonored by Agamemnon, whom he considers his inferior), leading to a dereliction of her duties as a priestess (similar to Achilles refusal to fight), which eventually turns towards Achilles due to his killing of her brothers in battle (Achilles' wrath towards Agamemnon refocuses upon Hector after the slaying of Patroclus). All of Achilles' events also occur in the novel, but they have been prefigured both in immortal and mortal form already in the story.

Hand of Fire (2014) is a clear parallel on several levels, but it is by no means the only one of the target texts to contain this sort of mirroring both in "framed story" (i.e. the telling of the myth which is clearly delineated and set apart within the novel itself) and mirroring in broader narrative. For example, mirroring on the narrative level is further apparent in Bova's *The Hittite*, in which the narrator (the titular Hittite) Lukka attempts to recover his family. Lukka's wife and two sons have been enslaved and allotted to Agamemnon:

"But my sons," I said. "My wife."

"Too soon to ask for them, Hittite. You saw how angry he was over returning the slave to Achilles. You can imagine how he'd react to your request."

"But he has no right to them!"

Very softly, Odysseos replied, "He is the High King. That is all the right he needs." (Bova 2010: 214)

Lukka's story seems to differ from Achilles' in that he resolves to serve in Agamemnon's forces until such a time as he can 'ransom' them back from Agamemnon through his service. This plan ends in tragedy, however, as Lukka's wife is instead sacrificed to the Greek gods. At this point, Lukka takes his sons and departs from the Achaean host, also allowing Helen to 'stow away' in his caravan as he leaves, manifesting his wrath through inaction. His inaction is allowing her to hide in his caravan and not informing his former allies and superiors that Helen, for whom they are

all searching, is hiding among his possessions. This model is both a mirror and a distortion.

Hockenberry in *Ilium* (Simmons 2003) clearly parallels, and at times even replaces, Achilles in aspects of his cycle of *menis* in the *Iliad*. After he changes the course of the Trojan War (disobeying the will of Zeus) and is caught, his thoughts are what the target audience might imagine Achilles' thoughts upon realizing that for all his power his *menis* is still not enough to avert his fate:

My scalp hurts from being dragged and my pride hurts from being caught and stripped naked so easily.

Who did I think I was? I've been watching gods and superheroes so long that I forgot that I was just an ordinary guy when I was real. (Simmons 2003: 659)

6.3 Addition of reactions to *menis* as translations of *menis*

Reaction, as an addition transformation within adaptation, is crucial to the translation of realia of the Homeric society. Reactions of characters within the story are important indicator to the target text audience of causes and manifestations of *menis*. The reactions act as indexes for the target audience; they “point to” the severity of the social and cosmic unbalance which is *menis*.

The most important reactions to a cause of *menis* that is added are the reactions of the assembly watching Agamemnon take Achilles' *timē* in the source text versus in target texts. In the source texts, the reactions of none of the assembly apart from Nestor are shown. Nestor makes a speech to Agamemnon and Achilles urging both to back down and “yield”; both neglect his advice. Aside from this lone, elderly king, not one word is said of the reactions of the other kings and warriors who witness this violation of Achilles' honor. In the target texts, however, if and when the assembly is depicted directly in the text (as opposed to being told to a point of view character), that depiction includes some manner of the assembled audience's reaction. The reaction of the fictional audience functions as a model for the target audience to interpret and understand

Agamemnon's offense. It is a way of translating what the audience within the *Iliad* and the source text audience of the *Iliad* knew instinctually from being raised within the society which contained conceptual realia such as *timē* and *menis*: Agamemnon's offense against Achilles will be interpreted by Achilles as not only personal, but also as an offense against the entire cosmic world order.

It is not only reactions toward causes of *menis* that translate realia for the target text audience. Also important are the reactions in response to manifestations of *menis*. Reactions to manifestations of wrath may be subdivided into reaction in narrative and reaction in dialogue. Reaction in narrative may take several forms. A popular form in the target texts is physical signs of reactions are often employed in the target texts to demonstrate the what the target text author believes the visceral reaction of a member of the source text audience might be. In *Hand of Fire* (Starkston 2014), Briseis is horrified by Achilles' *menis* when she witnesses his treatment of Hector's body: "Achilles untied the torn and mangled body and flung it facedown in the dirt. Briseis crouched down and threw up. This murderous warrior was the father of her child" (Starkston 2014: 273). Briseis is sickened by Achilles' outrageous behaviour and juxtaposes the notions of "murderous warrior" and "father".

And, Achilles tells us now, he chooses life. Here this...this...hero, this mass of muscle and testosterone, this living legend demigod...he chooses life over glory. It's enough to make Odysseus squint in disbelief and Ajax gape. (Simmons 2003: 429)

Reaction in dialogue to manifestations of *menis* often takes the form of insults and hostile language. People, often Achilles, are called variations of "dog" when they behave in a bloodthirsty manner. One insult, repeated from the *Iliad* in many of the target texts, is the admonishment of shamelessness.

While reactions to appeasement of *menis* are not as prominent as the reactions to causes and manifestations they are still significant where they appear. A good example can be found in *Ransom* (Malouf 2009), a novel which focuses on the appeasement of *menis* to a greater extent than the other target texts. As Priam prepares to leave Troy to

approach Achilles and beg for his son's body back, Hecuba is disbelieving that Achilles, who has strayed so far from acceptable human behavior, is capable of fulfilling the reciprocal obligations of society he once held and accepting ransom. She says to Priam:

'And you expect him to do it?' she hisses. The scorn in her voice is withering. 'You expect that...jackal, that noble bully, to be moved by this touching pantomime?' [...] He [Achilles] tied Hector's feet to the axlebar of his chariot, a thing unheard of, and dragged his body in the dust. And you expect this wolf, this violator of every law of gods and men, to take the gift you hold out to him act like a *man*?' (Malouf 2009: 57–58)

CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have argued that *menis* constitutes realia. Realia are the ‘untranslatables’ of culture: the peculiarities of daily life, of custom, of thought. *Menis* is a conceptual realia that is often ‘translated’ as rage or wrath. It would be better translated as a sanction against taboo. In order to fully understand this sanction, it is necessary to also translate the realia that constitute the Greek cultural system of taboo. With this in mind, in answer to the first question posed in the research questions, “Do 21st century literary adaptations of the *Iliad* translate the motif of *menis*?”, the answer is yes, but not entirely.

Having established that the adaptations do translate the motif of *menis* (at least to some extent) the goal of this thesis has been to analyze the various ways *menis*, as realia, is translated into contemporary novel adaptations of the *Iliad*. To accomplish this, I have used the system of transformations developed by Dirk Delabastita to examine how the target texts adapt the untranslatable from source culture and source text to target culture and target text. I have divided my conception of *menis* as a sanction into three interrelated parts (cause, manifestation, appeasement) under which I have discussed transformations of elements of each part. In terms of transformations, there is a large pattern of repetition which also ‘deletes’ the strength of the meaning coupled with substitution which also ‘adds’. Aspects of the motif of *menis* that are well preserved are done so through a combination of all the transformation operations, as well as the translation of other Homeric realia for context of *menis*. Aspects that are deleted in the target texts tend to be deleted through a deletion of meaning rather than complete omission of an event. Where there is a deletion of meaning, there is also often substitution in the target text. Aspects preserved are the events; aspects transformed are the meaning of those events if not relevant to the target audience. Essentially, the motif of *menis* is, as a whole, not so much lost as transformed.

Two questions the analysis raises are:

- 1) Is there any way to evaluate the relative success of the transformations in each

target texts? Or the contributions of the transformations to the success of the adaptation as a whole?

- 2) Is there a better system for typologizing realia? Instead of Delabastita's typology of transformations, would 'untranslatables' in adaptation benefit from analysis within a different typology of transformations.

Research under the second question may explore the connections between the notions of conceptual thinking and 'untranslatability,' and merits further thought.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Bova, Ben 2010. *The Hittite*. New York: Tor.

Clarke, Lindsay 2004. *The War at Troy*. London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Cook, Elizabeth 2001. *Achilles*. London: Picador.

Elyot, Amanda 2004. *The Memoirs of Helen of Troy*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Fagles, Robert (Trans.) 1990. *The Iliad*. New York: Penguin Books.

George, Margaret 2006. *Helen of Troy*. New York: Penguin Books.

Geras, Adele 2002. *Troy*. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt.

Lattimore, Richmond 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Malouf, David 2009. *Ransom*. New York: Vintage International.

Miller, Madeline 2011. *The Song of Achilles*. New York: Ecco (Harper Collins).

Simmons, David 2003. *Ilium*. New York: Harper Voyager.

Starkston, Judith 2014. *Hand of Fire*. Tucson, AZ: Fireship Press.

Secondary sources

Adkins, A.W.H. 1982. Values, Goals, and Emotions in the *Iliad*. *Classical Philology* 77(4): 292–326.

Allan, William 2006. Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126: 1–35.

Bakhtin, Mikhail 1982. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Holquist, Michael (ed.). Emerson, Caryl; Holquist, Michael (trans.) Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Cunliffe, Richard John 2012[1924]. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect: Expanded Edition*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Delabastita, Dirk 1993. There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, With Special Reference to *Hamlet*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Finkelberg, Margalit 1998. *Timē* and *Aretē* in Homer. *The Classical Quarterly* 48(1): 14–28.

Florin, Sider 1993. Realia in translation. In: Zlateva, Palma (ed.), *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*. London, New York: Routledge, 122–128.

Grandjean, Didier; Rendu, Anne-Caroline; MacNamee, Terence; Scherer, Klaus R. 2008. The wrath of the gods: appraising the meaning of disaster. *Social Sciences Information* 47(2): 187–204.

Graziosi, Barbara; Haubold, Johannes 2005. *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*. (Classical Literature and Society.) London: Duckworth.

Herman, Gabriel 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, Brooke 2007. The *Iliad's* Economy of Pain. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137(1): 45–84.

Hutcheon, Linda 2006. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York, London: Routledge.

Knox, Bernard 1990. Introduction and notes. In: Homer, *The Iliad*. (Fagles, Robert trans.) New York: Penguin, 3–64.

Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latacz, Joachim 2004. *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery*. (Windle, Kevin; Ireland, Rosh, trans.). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Lattimore, Richmond 1951. Introduction. In: *The Iliad*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 11–55.

Lotman, Yuri; Uspensky, Boris 1978. Myth—name—culture. *Semiotica* 22(3/4): 211–233.

Lotman Yuri 1988. Text within a text. *Soviet Psychology* 26(3): 32–51.

Mayor, Adrienne 2003. *Greek Fire, Poison Arrows & Scorpion Bombs: Biological and*

Chemical Warfare in the Ancient World. Woodstock, New York, London: Overlook Duckworth.

Most, Glenn W. 2003. Anger and pity in Homer's *Iliad* In: Braund, Susanna; Most, Glenn W. (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 50–75

Muellner, Leonard 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Neal, Tamara 2006. Blood and Hunger in the *Iliad*. *Classical Philology* 101(1): 15–33.

Newman, John Kevin 1986. *The Classical Epic Tradition*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Pedrick, Victoria 1982. Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112: 125–140.

Popovič, Anton 1976. Aspects of Metatext" *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 3(3): 225–235.

Rabel, R. J. 1990. Apollo as a Model for Achilles in the *Iliad*. *American Journal of Philology* 111(4): 429–440.

Rutherford, Richard B. 1996. *Homer. Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics*. Published for the Classical Association, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Scully, Stephen 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Staten, Henry 1993. The Circulation of Bodies in the *Iliad*. *New Literary History* 24(2): 339–361.

Thompson, Diane P. 2004. *The Trojan War: Literature and Legends from the Bronze Age to the Present*. Jefferson, North Carolina, London: McFarland & Company.

Turkeltaub, Daniel 2005. The Syntax and Semantics of Homeric Glowing Eyes: "*Iliad* 1.200. *The American Journal of Philology* 126(2): 157–186.

Van Gorp, Hendrik 2004[1985]. "Translation and comparable transfer operations." In: e., *Übersetzung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*. Kittel, Harold (Ed). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 62–68.

Wilson, Donna 1999. Symbolic Violence in “*Iliad*” Book 9. *The Classical World* 93(2): 131–147.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Description of the target texts.

Bova, <i>The Hittite</i> (2010)	Historical fiction. First person limited point of view from Lukka, a Hittite soldier. He travels to Troy to find his wife and two sons who have been enslaved in the Greek camp. He fights on the side of the Greeks under Odysseus, but acts as emissary to the Trojans. 344 pages.
Clarke, <i>The War at Troy</i> (2004)	Historical fiction, fantasy. Third person omniscient point of view. Chronicles the Trojan War and related myths of all the major figures in a mostly chronological progression. Focuses on different characters and settings as story flows. 452 pages, plus glossary of characters.
Cook, <i>Achilles</i> (2003)	Fantasy, historical fiction. Third person omniscient point of view, focuses on Achilles from points of view of different characters including Achilles himself, Priam, Helen, and John Keats. 107 pages, plus glossary of characters.
Elyot, <i>The Memoirs of Helen of Troy</i> (2004)	Historical fiction. First person limited point of view from Helen. Pseudo-autobiography of Helen of Troy. 309 pages.
George, <i>Helen of Troy</i> (2006)	Historical fiction. First person limited point of view, from Helen. Follows from events directly related to birth before she was actually born until her death. 611 pages.
Geras, <i>Troy</i> (2002)	Young adult, historical fiction. Third person limited point of view, multiple point of view characters (all Trojan). Begins during Achilles' withdrawal from the war and ends with the fall of Troy. 358 pages.
Malouf, <i>Ransom</i> (2009)	Historical fiction. Third person limited point

	of view, switching between Achilles and Priam. Begins with Achilles childhood but bulk of the novel is an expansion of the meeting between Achilles and Priam. 224 pages.
Miller, <i>The Song of Achilles</i> (2011)	Historical fiction, romance. First person limited point of view, from the view of Patroclus. Begins with Patroclus' childhood and ends with reuniting with Achilles in the underworld after Achilles' death. 352 pages.
Simmons, <i>Ilium</i> (2003)	Science fiction. First person limited point of view from Hockenberry (for <i>Iliad</i> adaptation sections). Resurrected Homeric scholar Thomas Hockenberry is forced to observe the events of the Trojan War until he is driven to change the course of the war. 752 pages.
Starkston, <i>Hand of Fire</i> (2014)	Historical fiction, romance. First person limited point of view from Briseis. Briseis is an Anatolian priestess/princess who is captured by Greek raiders and awarded to Achilles. 301 pages.

Appendix 2

Table of plague manifestation repetition transformation.

	Novel includes plague	Apollo is depicted unleashing plague	Plague is believed manifestation of gods' <i>menis</i>	Repetition of imagery
Bova, <i>The Hittite</i> (2010)	No ⁹	No	No	No

⁹ The novel begins after the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon. The quarrel is included through expository dialogue. No mention is made of plague in narrative or dialogue.

Clarke, <i>The War at Troy</i> (2004)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes: "Within days pestilence struck the camp. It began among the dogs and mules first, but soon spread among the men from tent to tent." (288)
Cook, <i>Achilles</i> (2003)	No	No	No	No
Elyot, <i>The Memoirs of Helen of Troy</i> (2004)	Yes	No	No	No
George, <i>Helen of Troy</i> (2006)	No	No	No	No
Geras, <i>Troy</i> (2002)	No	No	No	No
Malouf, <i>Ransom</i> (2009)	No	No	No	No
Miller, <i>The Song of Achilles</i> (2011)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes: "[...] we saw the mules drooping against their fences [...] Then by midday it was the dogs [...] By late afternoon, every one of these beasts was dead, or dying, shuddering on the ground in pools of bloody vomit. [...] The next morning it was the men." (274)
Simmons, <i>Ilium</i> (2003)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes: "[...] pestilence has been creeping through the Greek ranks, first killing donkeys and dogs, then dropping a soldier here, a

				servant there, until suddenly in the past few days it has become an epidemic, slaying more Achaean and Danaan heroes than the defender of Ilium have in months.” (3)
Starkston, <i>Hand of Fire</i> (2014)	Yes	No	Yes: “Devastation like this comes from the gods” (232)	No

	<p>mother who herself bore you lay you on the death-bed and mourn you: no, but the birds and dogs will have you all for their feasting.’ (Lattimore translation 22.328-354)</p>
--	--

Appendix 4

Table of repetition of “dogs and birds” in the bodily desecration manifestation of the motif of *menis*, with special attention to Achilles’ desecration of Hector.

	Direct speech acts	Narrative (similes, imagery)
Bova, <i>The Hittite</i> (2010)		
Clarke, <i>The War at Troy</i> (2004)		
Cook, <i>Achilles</i> (2003)	‘No, Hector. We meet as animals. What’s left of you will go to the dogs.’ (39, direct speech: Achilles to Hector)	
Elyot, <i>The Memoirs of Helen of Troy</i> (2004)		
George, <i>Helen of Troy</i> (2006)	“The birds and dogs will have their fill of you.” (451, Achilles to Hector); “The birds will have at it, and what’s left over is for the dogs” (455, direct speech: Achilles to Trojan messenger)	
Geras, <i>Troy</i> (2002)	Hector: “I am dying beside my city walls. [...] Don’t leave my body to rot. The birds will peck it. The dogs...Let them bury me, or the dogs will suck at my bones.” [...] Achilles: “[...] Never. Die. And I	Was there a dead Trojan prince lying in a tent down there? And how was he lying? Covered, with dignity? Or naked, like a piece of rubbish thrown out to feed the dogs? (135)

	<p>wish the dogs the joy of your carcass.” (115)</p> <p>Priam to Hecuba: “And though it makes me ill to think of begging at the knees of that dog Achilles, I will do it for Hector.” (166)</p> <p>Woman screaming at Greek soldier for murder of Astyanax, infant son of Hector and Andromache: “Murderer! Dog!” (326)</p>	
Malouf, <i>Ransom</i> (2009)	Hecuba to Priam, upon learning his plan to ransom Hector’s body: “And you expect this wolf, this violator of every law of gods and men, to take the gift you hold out to him and act like a <i>man</i> ?” (190)	
Miller, <i>The Song of Achilles</i> (2011)	Thetis: “[...] The men of Greece,”—she spat the words—“are dogs over a bone. They will not give up preeminence to another.”	When Priam comes to Achilles to ransom Hector’s body: “In the deepest reaches of night, when even the wild dogs drowse [...]”
Simmons, <i>Ilium</i> (2003)	N/A	N/A
Starkston, <i>Hand of Fire</i> (2014)	Achilles, at the funeral of Patroklos: “Farewell, Patroklos. [...] Everything that I promised to do in your honor, I have done. I bring you Hector’s body, which I have dragged through the dust to be food for the ravening dogs [...]” (271)	<p>Briseis, while captive of Agamemnon, waiting to hear the outcome of the embassy to Achilles: “Briseis could not hold still. She washed trays and pitched scrapings where the dogs and birds would eat them [...]” (251)</p> <p>The fight over possession of Patroklos’ body: “Then, when all seemed lost, and the Trojans had hold of Patroklos’ body and would at any moment carry it back to their city to be a source of revenge for their dead, food for</p>

		<p>dogs and vultures, Achilles appeared [...]” (260-261)</p> <p>On the fate of Achilles: “Now death would stalk Achilles with the sure step of a hunting dog on the scent of its prey [...]” (262)</p>
--	--	--

KOKKUVÕTE

„*Menis*’e tõlkimine „Iliase“ 21. sajandi kirjanduslikes adaptatsioonides“

Magistritöö „*Menis*’e tõlkimine „Iliase“ 21. sajandi kirjanduslikes adaptatsioonides“ otsib vastust küsimusele: kui meie kaasaegsed romaanid adapteerivad „Iliase“ lugu, kas nad tõlgivad ka *menis*’t (raevu/vimma kui karistust)? Missugusel moel tänapäevased adaptatsioonid *menis*’t tõlgivad?

Töö sissejuhatuses tutvustatakse taustainfo loomiseks „Iliase“ põhisüžeed, valikuliselt „Iliase“ retseptioonilugu, antakse ülevaade väitekirjas kasutatud materjalidest, meetoditest ning töö eesmärkidest. Väitekirjas analüüsitakse kümmet „Iliast“ adapteerivat sihtteksti eesmärgiga leida *menis*’e tõlkimise korduvaid mustreid. Selleks et minna arvesse „Iliase“ adaptatsioonina, vastavad kõik uuritud sihttekstid teatud kriteeriumidele: neis peavad esinema „Iliase“ kesksed tegelased ja sündmused ning tegevuspaigana müütiline „Trooja“. Sihttekstide analüüsimise eesmärk on *menis*’e tõlkimise vormide tüpologiseerimine.

Esimene peatükk, mis kannab pealkirja „Adaptatsioon“, tegeleb tõlke ja adaptatsiooni teoreetilise raamistikuga. Peatükis käsitletavate teemade seas on metatekst, kultuuriline rekodeerimine, transformatsioonioperatsioonide tüpoloogia ja reaaliid. Alapeatükk „Metatekst“ kirjeldab adaptatsiooni kui tõlget ning seostab adaptatsiooni Anton Popoviči metateksti määratlusega. Alapeatüki „Kultuuriline rekodeerimine“ fookuses on lähtekoodi (ja -kultuuri) ning sihtkoodi (ja -kultuuri) vahel käibivad rekodeerimisstrateegiad. Alapeatükk „Tüpoloogia“ tutvustab sihttekstide analüüsi aluseks olevat transformatsioonioperatsioonide tüpoloogiat, mille on välja arendanud Dirk Delabastita. Meetodid, kuidas *menis*’t on sihttekstides tõlgitud, jaotatakse korduse, asenduse, lisanduse, väljajätu ja permutatsiooni kategooriatesse vastavalt Delabastita kirjeldatule. Alapeatükk „Reaaliad“ selgitab tõlkimatute kultuuriliste objektide mõistet, nagu seda on määratlenud Sider Florin.

Teine peatükk, „*Menis*’e motiiv“, algab *menis*’e mõiste põhjaliku määratlemisega. See määratlus põhineb esmajoones klassikalise filoloogi Leonard

Muellneri töö mõiste ning selle lähtekultuurilise tähenduse uurimisel. Järeldus, milleni Muellner jõudis ja millel põhineb käesolevas väitekirjas väljendatud arusaam *menis*'e mõistest, seisneb lühidalt arusaamas, et *menis* ei ole „intensiivne raev“, nagu seda tavapäraselt tänapäeval tõlgendatakse, vaid on pigem „karistus“ (sanktsioon), mille kutsub esile oht ühiskondlikule korrale (ja sedakaudu ka kogu universumi jumalikule korral). Lähtekultuuris *menis*'t esilekutsuvate ohtude mõistmiseks on oluline tunda lähtekultuuri reaale, mida tutvustatakse alapeatükis „Teised reaalsed lähtetekstis“.

Väitekirja kolmas, neljas ja viies peatükk analüüsivad ja kategoriseerivad *menis*'e tõlkeid sihttekstides. Peatükkide fookuses on *menis*'e tsüklid, millest esimese all käsitletakse *menis*'e põhjuseid, teises *menis*'e ilmnemise vorme ning kolmandas *menis*'e lepitusviise. Kolmas peatükk, „Põhjuste tõlkimine“, keskendub küsimustele, mis põhjustab *menis*'t sihttekstides, võrreldes *menis*'e põhjustega lähtetekstis. Põhjuste peamisteks transformatsioonideks on *timē* („au“) riivamise kordamine ja väljajätt, kurbuse kordamine ning kehalise autonoomia rikkumise lisamine. Neljas peatükk, „Ilmnemise vormide tõlkimine“, keskendab tähelepanu viisidele, kuidas väljendatakse *menis*'t lähteteksti tõlkimisel sihttekstideks. See peatükk jaotub kolmeks suuremaks osaks, millest igaüks keskendub *menis*'e teatavale ilmnemise vormile, milleks on esiteks „looduse/jumalate“ kaudu ilmnev *menis*, teiseks „kehalise rüvetamise ja deformeerimise“ väljenduv *menis* ning viimaks *menis* kui „tegevusetus“. „Looduse/jumalate“ kaudu ilmneva *menis*'e all kõneldakse *menis*'e tõlkimisest veeks, tuleks ja katkuks. „Kehalise rüvetamise ja deformeerimise“ all peetakse silmas *menis*'t kui inimlikku kannatust ja surma, kuid eritählepanu pööratakse episoodile, kus Achilles tapab Hektori ja deformeerib tema keha. Peatüki kolmas osa keskendub *menis*'ele kui tegevusetusele ning selle tegevusetuse tähendusele. Viienda peatüki fookuses on *menis*'e lepitusviiside tõlkimine (eelkõige kordamise, asendamise ja väljajätuna) jaotatuna alapeatükkidesse: lepitus „suuremale *menis*'ele alistumise“ kaudu, lepitus „kaastunde ja empaatia“ teel, lepitus tänu matuse- ja/või jagatud toidukorra „rituaalile“, ning lepitus *menis*'t esilekutsunud rikutud „tasakaalu“ taaskehtestamise“

teel.

Kuues peatükk esitab sünteesi kolmandas, neljandas ja viiendas peatükis kirjeldatud tõlkemustritest ning pakub välja *menis*'e sihttekstides ilmnevate tõlkimisviiside mudeli. Peatükk annab eelnenud peatükkide alusel üldise ülevaate transformatsioonimustritest ning lisaks veel kahest sihttekstidest leitud suuremast transformatsioonist, mis hõlbustavad *menis*'e tõlkimist. Nendeks kaheks suuremaks transformatsiooniks on „*menis*'e tekstisisese mudeli kordamine ja asendamine“ ning „*menis*'ele reageerimise lisamine kui *menis*'e tõlkimine“. Esimene suurem transformatsioon seisneb selles, et „Iliase“ esimeses raamatus ilmnevat lühikest Apolloni *menis*'t kirjeldavat episoodi (põhjusest ilmingu ja lepituseni) sihttekstides alati kas korratakse või asendatakse. Teise transformatsiooni käigus lisatakse reageerimine *menis*'ele kui selle tõlkimine: sihttekstide autorid kasutavad jutustaja või tegelaste tekstisiseseid reaktsioone selleks, et „tõlkida“ sihtpublikule, kuidas tuleks *menis*'t mõista ja sellele reageerida.

Kokkuvõtteks: „Iliase“ adapteerimisel sihttekstideks *menis*'t tõlgitakse, kuid mitte täielikult. *Menis*'t üldjuhul ei tõlgita kui karistust („sanktsiooni“) ja seega ei tõlgi adaptatsioonid täielikult reaale. Need *menis*'e motiivi tahud, mis on adaptatsioonides edukalt säilinud, on tõlgitud kasutades kombineerituna kõiki transformatsiooniperasioone. Väljajäetud tahkude puhul on enamjaolt jäetud edasi andmata teatud sündmuse tähendus, mitte aga kogu sündmus tervikuna. Üldkokkuvõttena võib öelda, et *menis*'e motiiv tervikuna adaptatsioonides transformeerub.

SUMMARY

“Translations of *Menis* in 21st Century Literary Adaptations of the *Iliad*” addresses the question: if contemporary novels adapt the of the story of the *Iliad*, do they also translate *menis* (wrath/rage as sanction)? In what ways do modern adaptations translate *menis*?

The introduction provides background information on the “essential plot” of the *Iliad*, a selected history of the *Iliad*'s reception, an overview of the materials and methods used in the thesis, and the goals of the thesis. The thesis analyzes ten target texts (adaptations) of the *Iliad* to find patterns of translation of *menis*. These target texts all fit certain criteria to be counted as an adaptation of the *Iliad*: inclusion of vital characters, events, and the setting of mythic “Troy”. The goal of analyzing these target texts is to typologize the forms of translation of *menis*.

The first chapter, “Adaptation,” addresses the theoretical framework of translation and adaptation. This chapter includes sections on metatext, cultural recoding, typology of transformation operations, and realia. The subsection “metatext” describes adaptation as translation and relates adaptation to Popovič's definition of metatext. “Cultural recoding” deals with strategies of recoding between a source code (and source culture) to a target code (and target culture). The “typology” subsection introduces the transformation operations typology by Dirk Delabastita as the typological basis for the analysis of the target texts. The methods of translating *menis* in the target texts are categorized into repetition, substitution, addition, deletion, and permutation according to Delabastita's understanding. “Realia” describes the notion of untranslatable cultural objects as defined by Sider Florin.

The second chapter, “The Motif of *Menis*,” begins with a thorough definition of the concept of *menis*. This definition is primarily based on the work of classicist Leonard Muellner's examination of the concept and its meaning in its source culture. The conclusion reached by Muellner which is the foundation of the understanding of *menis* in the thesis is that *menis* is not “intense anger” as it is usually interpreted as today, but

is instead a “sanction” that is invoked when there is threat to societal order (and through societal order, divine order of the entire universe). Necessary to understanding *menis*-incurring threats to the source culture's society are realia of the source culture, which are explicated in the subsection “Other realia in source text”.

The third, fourth, and fifth chapters directly analyze and categorize the translations of *menis* in the target texts. They each address a part of a 'cycle' of *menis*, with the cycle understood as “causes of *menis*,” “manifestations of *menis*,” and “appeasements of *menis*.” The third chapter, “Translation of Causes,” deals with translations of provocation: what 'causes' *menis* in the target texts, compared with the causes of *menis* in the source text. The major transformation operations of causes are sorted into repetition and deletion of violation of *timē* (“honor”), repetition of grief, and addition of violation of bodily autonomy. The fourth chapter, “Translation of Manifestations,” examines the manners in which *menis* is expressed in translation from the source text to the target texts. This chapter is largely divided into three parts under which manifestations fall: *menis* manifested through “Nature/the gods,” *menis* expressed through “Repetition of mutilation and body desecration,” and finally, *menis* as “Inaction.” Under “Nature/the gods” the translations of *menis* as water, as fire, and as pestilence are discussed. The other part of the chapter, “Repetition of mutilation and body desecration” considers *menis* as widespread human suffering and death, but pays special attention to repetition of the episode in which Achilles kills Hector and mutilates his body. In the third part, *menis* as inaction, and the deletion of the meaning of this inaction as *menis*, is discussed. The fifth chapter concerns the “Translation of Appeasement” of *menis*. In this chapter, subsections discuss the repetition, substitution and deletion of *menis* “yielding to a greater *menis*,” being appeased by “pity and empathy,” “ritual” of funeral and/or sharing a meal, and the “reestablishment of 'balance'” that was violated and incurred *menis*.

The sixth chapter synthesizes the patterns of translation described in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters to create a “model” of the translation of *menis* in the target

texts. This chapter outlines overall patterns of transformation from the preceding chapters, and also discusses two major transformations found in the target texts that facilitate the translation of *menis*: the “repetition and substitution of self-contained models of *menis* within the texts,” and the “addition of reaction to *menis* as translations of *menis*.” The first major transformation is that the brief episode of Apollo's *menis* (from cause to manifestation to appeasement) in the first book of the *Iliad* is always either repeated or substituted in the target texts. The second transformation is the addition of reactions to *menis* as translating *menis*; target text authors rely on the in-text reactions of the narrator or characters to 'translate' for the target audience how they should react to and understand *menis*.

In conclusion, *menis* is translated from the *Iliad* into the target texts, but not completely. *Menis* is not typically translated as a “sanction” and thus the adaptations do not wholly translate the realia. Aspects of the motif of *menis* that are well preserved are done so through a combination of all the transformation operations. Aspects that are deleted tend to be deleted through a deletion of meaning rather than complete omission of an event. Ultimately, the motif of *menis* is, as a whole, transformed.

Non-exclusive license to reproduce thesis and make thesis public

I, _____,
(*author's name*)

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive license) to:

1.1. reproduce, for the purpose of preservation and making available to the public, including for addition to the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright, and

1.2. make available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright,

(title of thesis)

supervised by

2. I am aware of the fact that the author retains these rights.

3. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe the intellectual property rights or rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act.

Tartu, 20.05.2016