
Rosetta

Brown, E. (2013) 'Response to Ruth Léger'

Rosetta **14**: 101.

<http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue14/mackin.pdf>

Response to Ruth Léger

Ellie Brown

My initial article was necessarily short, owing to the nature of the issue in which it appeared (the proceedings of the 2013 *Annual Meeting of Postgraduates in Ancient Literature*), which is why several of the points raised that could have been significantly further extended were not. I would, therefore, only like to briefly address the comments on my article. At the end of the first paragraph, the author states that I tried 'to connect Achilles' grief over his friend with his own looming death to such an extent that the two are practically interchangeable.' Indeed, I believe that the two acts are practically interchangeable and the fact that Achilles' death does not occur in the *Iliad* does not change this fact. The penultimate paragraph of the review acknowledges that Patroklos' death foreshadows Achilles' own, and so I will not comment more on this issue.

The only other point I would like to contend with is the review's misunderstanding of my argument regarding Achilles' eating. Feasting does, as the review mentions and I mentioned in my original article, play a significant role in funerary rites, both historical and Homeric. The issue with Achilles' eating is twofold: the timing of eating (as I discussed in the original article, Patroklos' funeral is conducted out of sequence, which makes this timing significant) and that he used it to break a long-standing fast that was self-proclaimed as being tied to his act of revenge.

I am unsure why the review highlights an objection to purification being (or not being) part of the prothesis phase of funerary rites, as they do not discuss this further in the context of my article, nor does the review's reading change my argument in any way. Finally, I would like to thank the reviewer for their thoughtful comments on my article.